

My feeling is that reclassification could very well be considered at the beginning of the next session of Congress, when there will be ample time to provide a real reclassification system. I may say that during all the time I have been in Congress I have urged a classification of postal employees.

For many years when a person went into the postal service he entered at a pay level of \$1,700. He received four \$100 raises during the next 4 years, which brought him to \$2,100. There he levelled off for all time.

I remember the first time I appeared before a congressional committee in the House and urged a change in the plan.

Gradually we have worked away from it to a certain degree, but even yet we have what I consider a rather antiquated system. A postal employee now enters the service at a level of some \$3,200. He receives an increase of \$100 a year for eight years, eventually reaching \$4,070, and there levels off for all time.

In most of the Federal Departments after a person is appointed he receives promotions as his length of service and his merits may deserve, so that ordinarily a person entering Government service may have the hope of going on up the ladder until he reaches grade 12, grade 13, or possibly grade 14, or even a higher grade. But not so with the postal employee, who can only hope to reach a ceiling of \$4,070, which is perhaps grade 5.

I certainly think that situation should be changed. However, I do not believe we should hang at this time upon a reclassification bill the proposal to give postal employees a pay raise in keeping with the increase in the cost of living.

Postal employees must depend upon Congress for any pay increase. Unfortunately, when a pay increase is presented to the Congress, it is not always considered solely on its merits, but is frequently involved in the questions of Federal expenditures and the presence or absence of a postal deficit. These are policy matters and I do not believe they should have a determining position in a discussion of an adequate wage for postal employees.

I urge my colleagues who are on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the Senate to take up this matter for consideration as early as possible. A large percentage of postal employees are compelled to seek extra employment. Their present salaries are not sufficient to give them the standard of living they should have, and I hope that this matter can be considered shortly in this session.

#### REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 8224) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, since we passed legislation granting relief to motion picture exhibitors, which measure, by the way, was vetoed by the President, I have been advised that an additional 2,000 small theaters have closed their doors. I have been informed that we can expect an additional 3,000 small theaters to close within the next 6 to 8 months.

The amendment which I have sent to the desk today makes provision for some tax relief which I think is absolutely necessary if we are going to save that segment of small business. As a member of the Small Business Committee and of a subcommittee of that committee I had the opportunity of participating in a number of hearings in various places in the country, and it was rather pathetic to see the difference between remaining in business and going under. I think the amendment which I have sent to the desk, if it is enacted into law, will afford a degree of relief which will be conducive to permitting many small theaters to remain in business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I desire to commend the Senator from Kansas for bringing this amendment forward at this time. I am glad he mentioned something with which many of us have been impressed, namely, the threat to small moving picture theaters throughout the country if some relief is not provided for them.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas will recall that while I had the honor of serving as chairman of the Small Business Committee, he was an able and active member of the subcommittee, and I believe he continued the work last year while legislation was pending. I suppose no one is better prepared to speak on the facts in the case than is the Senator from Kansas. I am sure he will recall that all through the country we found small moving picture theaters absolutely threatened with bankruptcy unless some relief could be provided.

In my own State, Mr. President, since April 1, 1953, 17 moving picture houses have had to close their doors. I imagine that number can be multiplied many times throughout the country. Literally hundreds of others are barely hanging on, wondering how much longer they may be able to continue in business.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. When he was chairman of the Small Business Committee it was my privilege to do some work along that line, and the Senator from Alabama took a very active part in it. We found that unless something were done, thousands of small theaters would go under. As the Senator well knows, when we finished the report last year it bore out some of the fears and experiences to which the Senator from Alabama has referred. I feel that unless we take some positive action, we may expect to see several thousand more theaters on the marginal line go into bankruptcy.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Charles Sparks Thomas, of California, to be Secretary of the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### RECESS

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 12, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 11 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Charles Sparks Thomas, of California, to be Secretary of the Navy.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-blessed God, who art our life, our joy and hope, we thank Thee for the privilege of ascending the heights of prayer to receive insight and inspiration in our quest and pursuit of the true, the beautiful, and the good.

We pray that Thou wilt give some special assurance of divine guidance to our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of the Congress as they faithfully seek to serve our generation.

May we be more sensitive and responsive to Thy companionship and counsel which we so desperately need in these days of turmoil and confusion.

Grant that the thoughts of our minds, the meditations of our hearts, the words of our lips, and the labors of our hands may always move in a blessed harmony and obedience to Thy holy will.

Hear us in our prayer for our needy brethren. May the doctors and nurses be blessed with wisdom-illuminated minds and skillful hands as they eagerly strive to hasten their recovery to health and strength of body.

We give Thee all the praise and glory through Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5509. An act to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, relating to the percent of colonels in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army; and

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the report thereon.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2231. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims.

#### UNITED STATES v. WARREN L. STEPHENSON

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify on March 15, 1954, at 9 o'clock a. m., in the case of United States against Warren L. Stephenson. Under the precedents of the House I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of the House, and I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read the subpoena, as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. WARREN L. STEPHENSON, CRIMINAL CASE No. 1838-53

NOTE.—Report to new courthouse between Third Street and John Marshall Place on Constitution Avenue NW., courtroom No. 8. Spad test: Court of Chief Judge Laws. THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM HESS,

House of Representatives,

Capitol Hill, District of Columbia:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, March 15, 1954, at 9 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the district attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this ---- day of -----, A. D. 19---

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By HAROLD G. DODD, Deputy Clerk.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 470) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representative WILLIAM E. HESS, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at Washington, D. C., on the 15th of March 1954, in the case of the *United States v. Warren L. Stephenson*, criminal case No. 1838-53; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative WILLIAM E. HESS is authorized to appear in response to

the subpoena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States v. Warren L. Stephenson* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 471) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. ORINDA JOSEPHINE QUIGLEY

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3832) for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JONAS of Illinois, BURDICK, and LANE.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Wednesday, March 17, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

#### FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Randall Commission report on foreign economic policy was submitted to the President and the Congress over 6 weeks ago. As yet, no concrete legislative proposals have been submitted to the Congress by the administration to carry out the major positive recommendations of the Commission. If the United States is to avoid another year of irreparably lost ground in the fight for a more intelligent foreign-trade policy, action must be commenced in the Congress without further delay. Each day's delay adds to the pressures that work against the development of a sound trade policy.

One of the recommendations of the Randall Commission was to modify the Buy-American Act to a basis of reci-

procuity with other nations. I believe that it would be to the best interest of the United States to repeal completely the Buy-American Act but I am willing to accept this modified proposal. I am, consequently, introducing a bill today to carry out the recommendations of the Randall Commission in respect to the Buy-American Act.

In the meantime, I think the administration can very well put into effect the administrative regulations for purposes of the Randall recommendations in respect to the Buy-American Act. Last year, I was officially informed by the Department of Defense that the official administrative policy in respect to the Buy-American Act would be controlled by the Randall Commission recommendations. As yet, there has been no evidence that this policy has been put into effect. I hope that action will be taken without further delay.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program of the day, and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

#### ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the Army civil functions appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1955.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

#### FOOD SHORTAGE IN YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 7, in the free city of Cleveland, in the district which I have the privilege to represent, there appeared a strange visitor on a very strange mission. This visitor was Vladimir Popovic, Ambassador to the United States for Communist Yugoslavia. While in Cleveland, Popovic gave a talk. He made some unusual statements and deviated from accepted diplomatic activities.

To begin with, he spoke about the drought which he claims occurred last summer in Yugoslavia, which in turn, created a severe food shortage. The actual facts about the food shortage in Yugoslavia are that there was no drought, and the food shortage has been created by the socialistic planners who call themselves Tito Communists. It is significant to note that Yugoslavia before its occupation by the alien Communists of Tito, had a surplus of food

and was one of the food-exporting countries of Europe. It is indeed strange that, under Tito, the people of Yugoslavia did not have enough to eat, let alone have food for export.

I would like to alert the Members of Congress to the possibilities that we are going to have the touch put on us again to supply food produced by freemen for the Tito clique in Yugoslavia. I wonder what sort of logic would permit us to supply Tito with food necessary to keep him in power.

Popovic also spoke about increased democracy in Yugoslavia. He pointed to what he claimed was a new system of parliamentary elections which permits new political parties to enter candidates in the elections, and increased personal and civil liberties. He did not, of course, tell the audience that the new so-called parliamentary elector system in Yugoslavia was a complete phony. He neglected to mention that the new political parties permitted to participate had to be Socialist parties; nor did he indicate, as he would have, had he told the whole story, that these new political parties have all pledged their loyalty to Tito.

Popovic made no mention about the persecution of religion in Yugoslavia nor did he explain why Archbishop Stepinac was still confined to his residence and prohibited from seeing the Yugoslav people who idolize him.

While Popovic was spreading his vicious Communist propaganda, some old-fashioned Americans took it upon themselves to provide him with a well-deserved greeting. One of the greeting committees was made up of Croatian Americans who have established an enviable record for their fight against communism here in the United States and elsewhere in the world. While Popovic was attending a dinner in my district, the Croatian patriots threw up a picket line around the affair. The second group of greeters was made up of Serbian new Americans, former displaced persons. They prepared a special reception for him at the hotel where he was staying to make certain that he would be properly identified as the representative of a Communist dictator.

When Popovic was asked what he thought about the Croatian American and Serbian American protests about his visit to Cleveland, he said:

The Serbs were what we would have called quislings in Yugoslavia, and the Croats were political emigrants of 35 years ago. They do not know what is going on.

Is that not a strange state of affairs wherein a Communist Ambassador to the United States can visit one of our great cities, accept its hospitality, and then climax his visit by attacking the character and patriotism of loyal, freedom-loving Americans in the community?

In my opinion, his actions in Cleveland are in clear violation of his diplomatic status in the United States. Moreover, he has taken advantage of American hospitality to spread the propaganda line of Communist Yugoslavia. It is about time the United States Government called a halt on these Communist agents who are posing as Ambassadors.

I call upon the Department of State to make an official protest to the Yugoslav Government for the slanderous activities of Popovic while in Cleveland this week, and to demand an official apology and a retraction of what he said about the patriotic Croatian American and Serbian American groups in Cleveland.

#### TO ESTABLISH LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER OF OFFICERS TO SERVE IN COMMISSIONED GRADES OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 462) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7103) to establish limitations on the numbers of officers who may serve in various commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, and all points of order against such bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE]; and at this time I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 462 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 7103, which is a bill to establish limitations on the numbers of officers who may serve in various commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

This bill is brought to the House by the House Committee on Armed Services and is for the purpose stated in the title, of limiting the number of commissioned officers.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should be adopted and the bill, in my opinion, should be passed.

I reserve the balance of my time and yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7103) to establish limitations on the number of officers who may serve in various commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7103, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, due to the limitation of time, I would like to say to the membership of the House, since we have but 1 hour, under the rule, that probably questions, if there are any, can be answered during the debate under the 5-minute rule, and the clarifying can then be done.

Last March a subcommittee of which I had the pleasure of being chairman was assigned the task of looking into the billet justification for all officers in the armed services serving in the grades of colonel, general, Navy captain, and admiral.

The hearings consumed 22 days. I believe it was one of the most interesting inquiries with which I have ever been associated.

The hearings began in March of 1953 and they continued even after the Defense Appropriation Act of 1954 had renewed the limitation on grade distribution for this fiscal year.

The subcommittee, among other things, was charged with the responsibility of developing a fair, workable plan which would establish ceilings on temporary promotions in the higher grades. Unfortunately, it was not possible to complete our work in the last session of the Congress.

We felt that it would be better to do the job thoroughly, introduce a bill, present it to the full committee, conduct extensive hearings on the bill, and then report the bill to the House as we are doing today.

I mention this in order to give you some background of the effort that has been put forth in attempting to prepare a bill dealing with one of the least understood and yet one of the most important aspects of personnel planning in our Armed Forces.

Our inquiry into the assignments of senior officers disclosed instances in which senior officers were serving in areas which could be adequately served

by more junior officers. And if you will read the hearings, you will find several examples of senior officers occupying billets which we felt were upgraded. On the other hand, we also found billets occupied by junior officers that more properly should have been filled by senior officers.

It would have been difficult, if not impossible, to thoroughly examine every billet. In some instances we considered the billets in groups. For example, there can be no disagreement that every regimental commander in the Army should be a full colonel, and yet not every regimental commander in the Army is a full colonel. And, in terms of dollars and responsibility, I think there could be little doubt in anyone's mind that a squadron of aircraft should be commanded by a lieutenant colonel; yet in many instances squadrons are commanded by officers of lesser grades.

So I think I can safely say that the net result of the inquiry has led us to the conclusion that there is no over-exaggerated grade structure in the Armed Forces. The stock has not been watered.

Proceeding on from that point, it was the consensus of the subcommittee that the only practical solution to the problem of imposing ceilings on temporary promotions was a sliding-scale system spelled out in law based on the theory that as the total number of officers on active duty increases, the proportion of senior officers decreases. And the system works in reverse when each service decreases its total officer strength.

That system made sense to us, and that is the system which is proposed in this legislation. It establishes ceilings for the Army and Air Force not heretofore in existence in law. And it makes more restrictive the ceilings that now exist for the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Now I think we ought to be familiar with what a temporary promotion is before we discuss the matter further, because after all, that is what we are attempting to regulate.

A temporary promotion is nothing more and nothing less than what the word implies. It is a commission given to an officer on a temporary basis which entitles him to the pay of that grade, while holding the commission and it entitles him to all the other benefits and privileges associated with the grade.

Now when it comes to the case of full generals and lieutenant generals, I think we must always bear in mind that the basic pay is the same as that of a major general; in other words, the pay of a full general, a lieutenant general and a major general is the same. Even their allowances for subsistence and quarters are the same; the only difference is in a special allowance granted to a lieutenant general which amounts to the magnificent sum of \$500 a year. A full general receives a more bountiful bonus from the Federal Government—he receives \$2,200 a year. The grades of lieutenant general and general are always temporary.

Now you will note that this bill does not contain any ceiling on the grade of lieutenant general and above. The reason for that is simple. These positions are designated by the President as posi-

tions of responsibility and officers may serve in them only when confirmed by the Senate and only while serving in such a designated position.

All other officers holding temporary commissions may serve in the various grades at the pleasure of the President. If it should become necessary, in an extremely rapid demobilization, all of the officers holding temporary grades could be reverted to their permanent grade. In other words, there is nothing sacred about a temporary commission. It can be removed, wiped out, by the stroke of the President's pen. That is not true of permanent commissions. An officer can only lose his permanent commission as the result of legal action or resignation.

Now back in 1947, when we all had hopes of peace in the world, we wrote a law, called the Officer Personnel Act, which contemplated a peacetime armed force of about 35,000 line officers of the Navy, some 30,600 officers in the Army, some 7,000 in the Marine Corps, and some 27,500 in the Air Force. We established a percentage system for distributing those officers among the various grades on a permanent basis. We then hoped that by 1957 adjustments would have been made, humps would have been smoothed out, and after 1957 we would have an armed force made up predominantly of regulars. Promotion was to flow along a normal pattern after so many years of service in each grade, although each officer was required to go through a selection process for that promotion.

Unfortunately, world conditions did not permit us to go into that smooth system, but the Officer Personnel Act had foreseen the possibility of some maladjustment in the international situation, and thus provided for temporary promotions on the theory that they might be needed until world conditions stabilized and we had nothing but a regular peacetime establishment.

Unfortunately, world conditions have not brought about that stability and temporary promotions have been used to such an extent that nearly half of the Regular officers, and a large number of Reserve officers, hold temporary commissions. This type of promotion fills a definite need, but it does not carry with it the inflexibility of a permanent commission. As a matter of fact, any other system but a temporary promotion system would create tremendous difficulties which would undoubtedly necessitate special retirement laws similar to those put into effect after World War I, which could prove extremely costly. So I hope you will keep in mind that a temporary promotion not only establishes a promotion system which is intended to be of benefit to the taxpayer during periods of rapid mobilization or demobilization, but it is also intended to provide a degree of flexibility for the Armed Forces which will avoid freezing people into grades for long periods of time.

You have heard about some of our military leaders who were lieutenants for 16 or 17 years back in the 1920's and 1930's. We do not want that to happen again. You cannot ask young men in

this day and age to make the service a career either as reservists or Regulars with that kind of promotion possibility staring them in the face.

Now it must be remembered that what we propose here are ceilings on temporary promotions on the grade of major and above. This does not mean that the services will promote officers to the grade distribution established by these ceilings but it does permit the services, when necessary, to go to these ceilings—ceilings which are geared to a system of promotion complicated by service-in-grade requirements, periods of service after which consideration for promotion is required, best qualified, best fitted and fully qualified systems of selection, anticipated forced separation, guaranteed years of service and all of the other technicalities so necessary in this field which deals with men's careers.

I will not attempt to explain all of these terms except to say that they are all aimed at giving an officer a fair opportunity for being considered for promotion to the next higher grade with the assurance that having been selected he will be promoted as vacancies occur and with the further assurance that even if vacancies do not occur, in the Army and the Air Force, after a certain number of years of service in grade, the officer must be promoted if qualified.

Those times and procedures run throughout the whole promotion system; that is why we feel that a yearly numerical limitation such as that contained in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1954 could create havoc with the entire promotion system and with the morale of our officers if it is projected into the future and if the number is decreased as the number of officers on active duty decreases.

All we are trying to say is that there will be times in the future under this permanent law when these ceilings may have to be attained. Normally, they will not be attained; but we must provide for the likelihood or possibility that in certain years, as age groups move up in service, these ceilings will be attained.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say that the Davis amendment or the Scribner amendment, are the principal reasons why young men are not entering the Armed Forces today on a career basis. But I do say that they are among the reasons why young men are not entering our Armed Forces today and why resignation rates are high among the Regular officers. Stated simply, the young officers and some of the older officers in our Armed Forces are afraid that this tampering with their careers will become worse and eventually they will be frozen in grade at a time when they should be going forward but so late in their career that it will be difficult to make a change. I suggest you read the report to study the resignation rates and the number of young men who are declining appointments as Regular officers. You will see what is taking place; the trend is apparent and the results could be extremely serious. The young officers who are entering our Armed Forces today will be the generals of the next generation, and if we don't attract the type of young men with the

necessary ability to lead this Nation in the event of another conflict then we will pay a penalty far greater than anything ever extracted from the American people.

I hope the House will adopt this measure and that it will settle the question from here on out, so that the armed services and the officers who are responsible for the lives of our sons will be able to point to legislation which spells out their career opportunities. We can remove the uncertainty which now prevails throughout the Armed Forces by adopting this sliding scale system.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he begins with his address, please?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes, briefly.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] said that it is the purpose of this bill to assure a fair system of promotion. The Officers Personnel Act of 1947 had an innovation that provided that the Navy could vary from ordinary seniority considerations to promote officers whom it considered to be very well qualified. The act provided for 5 percent in this category. In spite of the fact that this committee thought this a very good provision at that time, and the Navy asked for it, the Navy has not used this system once. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us why the Navy has not used it and whether this provision would be affected by this bill.

Mr. KILDAY. I could not tell the gentleman why. That is not a question of legislation; that is a question of distribution. That has no relationship to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in 1947, during the 80th Congress, Congress enacted the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. That bill was the result of very long, detailed hearings held by a subcommittee of which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] was chairman. He is now, of course, chairman of the full Committee on Armed Services. The Officer Personnel Act of 1947 provided for the distribution of officers in the services on a percentage basis as between the grades. It contained a provision that during any period of national emergency thereafter declared that temporary promotions could be made. There has been no complaint from the services or elsewhere because of the permanent promotion system of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. However, before there had been adequate time to test the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act, the national emergency of Korea was declared. So that when we came to consider the military appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1953, the situation was that under the permanent law temporary promotions could be made and in the Army and Air Force there was a limitation on the numbers who could be promoted to the various grades.

At that time the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] offered an amendment to the appropriation bill which placed in that bill a limitation by finite numbers on those in the grade of captain and its equivalent and above.

I should have stated a moment ago that whereas there was no limitation on officers of the Army and Air Force in the various grades, there was a limitation on the Navy and Marine Corps, but it was probably too generous. So that that amendment was adopted and became known, of course, as the Davis amendment. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] had secured the figures which he had used for his amendment from the services, and the Navy in giving those figures to Mr. DAVIS, made an error in the numbers. So that in practice it developed that there was about to be a demotion of approximately 5,000 junior Navy officers because the Navy had made an error in calculating the figures it gave to Mr. DAVIS, and which were included in his amendment.

Last year we revised those figures and avoided those demotions. So that a new Davis amendment provision was carried for the fiscal year 1954. This bill would take the place of the Davis amendment. In other words, we would substitute this bill. But it follows exactly the same principle as that contained in the Davis amendment but fixes the finite numbers at such a level that future demotions will not take place and orderly promotions may continue.

In other words, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] has rendered a distinct service to the Congress and to the military services, and your Committee on Armed Services after very careful consideration and long deliberation has adopted the philosophy of the Davis amendment. So that hereafter the Officers Personnel Act of 1947 will provide a percentage distribution by grades within all of the military services for permanent promotion and it will provide by this amendment, carrying out the Davis amendment, a finite number of distributions and limitations upon temporary promotions.

There are several things that must be borne in mind with reference to the numbers on duty in the higher grades now as compared to the largest mobilization period during World War II. Time does not permit more than just a mention of them, perhaps. There is one thing that is significant. When you have a very large military establishment, the percentage of your higher ranking officers decreases; that is the percentage, not the numbers. When you have a smaller establishment, your percentages must increase because, if you have a division, on a peacetime basis, even if it is not up to your full service strength, still you have a major general in command. You have a colonel in command of a regiment and so on for your battalions and companies right down the line. So that your percentages operate in reverse.

There is another thing which controls the additional numbers in the higher ranks. At the time we considered the Act of 1947, those of us who had served formerly on the Committee on Military Affairs as distinguished from the former Committee on Naval Affairs, were very much surprised—and personally I was shocked—to find that in the Navy we were losing from 48 to 50 percent of our officers, our graduates from the

Naval Academy by forced attrition, after roughly 20 years of service. We felt that that was a loss of manpower and of money which should not be continued in the interest of the Nation and we took steps to prevent that forced attrition or that force-out after, roughly, 20 years of service. We did it by increasing the number of billets for flag or star officers. We did that very deliberately and I think with a very worthy purpose of seeing to it that we retained in the service men who were from 43 to 45 years of age, well under 50 years of age who had been retired to the extent of 45 to 48 or 50 percent in the Navy. We have reduced that to about 18 percent. I think we will all agree that was proper legislation.

This bill will make permanent law the proper distribution and limitation of temporary officers and eliminate the fears, the dangers, and the criticisms which were in existence prior to the adoption of the Davis amendment to the Appropriation Act of 1953. That is the most important provision of the bill.

For a clear understanding of that I would refer all of you to page 6 of the report. There is a very short, very succinct explanation of the purpose of this act. It is very quickly read, and it will fully explain that provision.

The only other thing the bill does is to repeal what was known as the Van Zandt amendment and later the Scrivener amendment, which was adopted in the 1953 and 1954 appropriation bills, which had the effect of prohibiting the retirement of Regular officers except for statutory age, physical disability, World War I service, or extreme hardship. That restriction was offered on the floor in each bill with only the limited debate that was permissible here at that time. It had the effect of changing permanent law that had been in existence long before 1947, was reexamined in 1947, and retained, under the provisions of which men may retire at a reduced pension after 20 years of service. It has since developed that such action has had a very bad effect on the morale of the service and on the retention of professional military men. It was construed as being a changing of the rules after the game had begun. We feel that that should be eliminated.

It is true it was justified at the time it was adopted, but it was brought forth, primarily, I believe, because of the retirement of a rather young general of the Air Force. We lost the services of a very capable combat general of the Air Force at a very early age. As in most cases where you legislate against one situation with general legislation, it has produced inequities and injustices through the service. It creates an attitude of uncertainty on the part of the personnel in all officer grades.

The bill has been very thoroughly considered. Frankly, it is the most tedious thing I have ever dealt with since I have been a Member of the House.

As the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] said, last year we went into the various billets, and we did require the services to give us the names of all flag officers and general officers and admirals,

their ages, length of service, the position they held, and the types of position. Then we took all of the colonels and the captains of the Navy in groups of the positions in which they were assigned. That continued, I believe, for something like 4 months, to about the time that we adjourned.

This year we have again gone into the overall question. The hearings we have here will show how carefully we did it this year. But this is only about one-third of the size of the hearings we held last year before the subcommittee on justifying individual billets.

I believe the bill to be one that is well considered, timely, and proper. It should be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, title III of H. R. 7103 relates to the Air Force, and the sliding scale contained in that title will effectively but realistically limit the number of Air Force officers who may serve on active duty in the grades above captain whenever the commissioned officer strength in the Air Force is between 50,000 and 180,000. I cannot foresee the day when the commissioned officer strength of the Air Force will be less than 50,000, and I anticipate that if the strength should ever go above 180,000 the country will be at war or mobilizing for war. In my opinion, and in the opinion of my fellow committee members, the scale represents as accurately as possible the true officer requirements of the Air Force under varying force structures during periods of relative peace or partial mobilization, and the Air Force has agreed that during such periods it will permit them to meet their requirements for field grade and general officers insofar as they can be anticipated at this time. Beyond that point, during periods of total mobilization or war, when force structures mushroom overnight, the Air Force must be free of this and other similar limitations which would hinder and complicate their operations.

This scale of permanent limitations is designed to remove the need for the grade limitations which have been placed on the Air Force officer structure in recent appropriation acts and which have interfered so seriously with the long-range personnel planning of our Air Force. The Congress must realize that when the services submit a budget to the Congress that budget represents in many respects the culmination of plans that were set in motion several years before; and in many other respects it represents the initial step in carrying out plans designed for the distant future. Annual limitations of the type contained in the last two appropriation acts are always either meaningless or extremely disruptive. If these limitations recognize and authorize the planning undertaken by the services, as was true in the current appropriations act, they are meaningless because they do not alter

any of the actions already planned. If, on the other hand, they actually serve to limit the actions of the services, as occurred when the original Davis amendment was enacted, they disrupt many of the carefully prepared, long-range plans and add to the complexity of the services' overall personnel problem. In either case, however, the repetition of such temporary limitations over an extended period of time can only create such a feeling of uncertainty in the minds of our military planners that they will be unable to prepare any sound, long-range plan for commissioned officers and will limit their planning each year so as to accomplish only those things which happen to be of immediate necessity. Additionally, these year-to-year limitations in rider form have a serious impact upon the morale of the officer corps, because they receive wide publicity and create considerable doubt in the minds of all officers. A fine young officer must certainly become discouraged when the Congress repeatedly enacts such limiting legislation at the same time that the service is demanding his highest standard of performance.

As I have stated before, we believe that the sliding scale contained in the Air Force title of this bill is an accurate representation of the Air Force's requirements for officers in the higher grades. Last year, your Committee on Armed Services conducted a searching inquiry into the requirements for general officers and colonels in the Air Force. Due to the magnitude of the problem and the time available, we found it impossible to extend our inquiry below the grade of colonel. However, we examined all positions occupied by general officers as well as all other positions which normally require a general officer. We also examined all of the positions which colonels are supposed to occupy in each of the services. In our opinion, a few of those positions did not appear to warrant the grade assigned by the services. But on the other hand, we found positions which seemed to us to be undergraded. Nevertheless, we think the Congress must realize that the military chief of each service is the man directly responsible for having the right man in the right job at the right time. When a Chief of Staff assigns one of his very limited number of general officers to any position, it is because his estimate of the situation indicates that the job requires a general officer at that particular time. Though our opinion may differ from his, we must recognize that the responsibility is his, and we must respect and trust his judgment. In general, the committee's inquiry demonstrated that the services' requirements for general officers and colonels are quite reasonable; that the responsibility and authority surrounding each military position are equivalent to the authority and responsibility associated with the grade which the services have established for the position. It is our conclusion, therefore, that, since the inquiry which we conducted proved the accuracy of the services' statement of requirements for general officers and colonels, their stated requirements for officers below the grade of colonel must also be accepted as valid.

We must either recognize the officer requirements of the services or bear the responsibility for requiring large numbers of officers to occupy positions demanding a high level of responsibility and performance without benefit of the grade and other emoluments commensurate with the positions. We must recognize that the senior grades in a military as well as a civilian enterprise are necessary to assure proper command, executive supervision, and professional leadership, as well as incentive. Refusing to recognize these requirements or to impose arbitrary restrictions upon them in no way alters the fact that the requirements exist. Arbitrary limitations placed upon the officer structures of the armed services serve only to compromise combat capability and esprit de corps to a degree which cannot be offset by theoretical monetary savings.

In addition to its being an accurate portrayal of the Air Force's requirements for senior officers, the schedule of limitations contained in title III of this bill will permit the Air Force to plan effectively for all those personnel actions, such as promotions, recall of Reserve officers, separations and retirements, without the fear of having those plans suddenly disrupted by some unpredictable legislative restriction on officer strengths. But it would be erroneous to presume that, after this bill becomes law, the Air Force will promote its officers right up to the maximum limitation. This will not happen for three reasons. First, there is the very practical reason that, because the scale is a fixed ceiling which cannot be exceeded, the Air Force will have to establish a slightly lower ceiling for planning purposes to prevent itself from inadvertently exceeding the limitations due to variations in the number of deaths, retirements and separations estimated to occur during any year. Secondly, it is customary practice to let promotions lag a little behind requirements during a buildup in order to make sure that those who are promoted can really do the job. And finally, the Air Force must always guard against the possibility of leveling off in strength with all of its vacancies filled and having to face a long period of promotion stagnation. To illustrate the manner in which promotions lag behind requirements in an expanding force, I refer to the situation which existed in the Army Air Corps in June of 1945. At that time, there were 54,805 positions for officers in the grades above captain, but the Air Corps strength in those grades numbered only 33,499. The difference represents 21,306 promotion vacancies which would have been filled eventually if the Air Corps strength had stabilized at that war-time level for a number of years. This comparison also points up one of the fallacies in the popular practice of comparing present-day officer strengths to those which happened to exist at some time in the past. Unless all of the conditions which influenced each strength can be included in the comparison, there can be no comparison.

Although the scale related to the Air Force will adequately satisfy the Air Force's requirements for officers in the higher grades at the strengths covered

by the scale during periods when the forces are either stabilized or expanded, there may be a very serious problem lurking behind that scale which we cannot attempt to resolve at this time. This problem concerns the effect which the scale could have upon Air Force officers during periods of extremely rapid and large-scale demobilization. With the sliding scale in effect during such periods, the Air Force will almost certainly find it necessary to demote large numbers of officers in temporary grades and to force great numbers of Reserve and temporary officers out of the active service at a very rapid rate in order to remain within the law. Since the limitation is effective only on the last day of each fiscal year, the annual budgetary cycle will give the Air Force a period of 12 to 18 months in which to plan and carry out these actions. However, a situation could easily develop where that period of time would be insufficient to permit the Air Force to take all the necessary actions without causing severe and unwarranted hardship upon large groups of officers. Should such a situation arise, the Congress will have to assist the Air Force in finding a solution to the problem.

The members of our committee have frequently been asked why the services are permitted to make temporary promotions. The answer to that question is that it is the only manner in which the services can fill the grade requirements generated by wartime or emergency conditions and at the same time retain sufficient flexibility to return to peacetime, minimum-strength personnel structures. We foresaw the requirement for temporary grades in expanded military forces at the time that we wrote the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, and we decided then that it would be far better to pin those grades on very lightly rather than to nail them down and add to the problem of reducing the officer grade structure at the end of an emergency period. However, the Armed Services Committee reexamined this subject during the hearings on this bill and decided that the need for temporary promotions still exists and will continue to exist for many years to come. It is our belief, however, that the sliding scale incorporated in H. R. 7103 will very effectively control temporary promotions in the future.

Turning now to section 402 of this bill, which will repeal the retired pay restriction that has been included in each annual appropriations act since 1951, it is my opinion that the effects of this arbitrary restriction on voluntary retirement have been for more detrimental than fruitful. Although the expressed purpose of the restriction, that of retaining in service the older and more experienced officer, is achieved, this goal is attained at the cost of shaken morale and stagnated promotion through all echelons of the officer corps. The expectation of being able to effect, at his own request, a dignified and honorable exit into retirement after 30 years of service, has long been cherished by the Regular officer. It is a basic feature of the implied contract existing between the Government and the officer. Furthermore, the privilege of retiring with

20 to 30 years of service, should the need arise, has added materially to the attractiveness of the military career in the eyes of the junior officers. A breach of faith in this regard on the part of the Congress does more than embitter the officers immediately affected, it also destroys the security and corrodes the incentive of the junior officer and strangles the service in its efforts to equitably administer the existing officer corps and to induce potential officers to embark upon a military career. If the prestige of that career is to be raised, if we are to retain the experienced officer and attract the potential officer, then we must protect and improve the traditional benefits of the career officer and not nullify them by limitations similar to the present retired pay restriction.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me reemphasize the adverse effect which the amendments to the annual appropriation acts have had on the morale of our officer corps. These amendments which restrict promotions and retirements represent two of the most damaging steps ever taken by the Congress toward confiscation of the benefits which have for so long been a part of the military career. Promotion and retirement are component parts of the overall blueprint for military service. A man who decides to spend his life in the service of his country expects and, I say, has the right to expect that those benefits which exist at the time he enters into such a contract will continue to exist and accrue for him while he serves. Limitations like these shake the confidence officers have in their service and raise grave doubts as to the wisdom of their choice. Their attitude can be very well summarized by the simple question: "What will they take away next?"

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this bill, H. R. 7103, without amendment and by the unanimous vote of all Members present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of this subcommittee for giving me this time to discuss this measure. I recognize the subcommittee had a very difficult task and I certainly want to express my appreciation to the members thereof for the very careful study which they did give to a problem, which is admittedly a very complex one. I have not been able to evaluate even for my own purposes the actual definite limitations that have been placed in this measure, but I certainly do want to express my hearty approval of the approach to the problem that has been made by this legislation because I believe it represents the only sound method, and that is the method of a sliding scale for providing permanent legislation for limitations on promotions in the Armed Services.

My primary purpose during these few minutes is to clarify, as I know the situation, some of the statements included in the report so that the legislative history of this act will be, perhaps, somewhat more accurate than would be indi-

cated by the report. There are two things that I do want to call to your attention, referring to the report in both cases. First of all, the report in a number of cases uses the term Davis amendment to apply to the limitations in the 1954 appropriation act. Merely to clarify the record, let me remind my colleagues that the Davis amendment was specifically repealed by Public Law 7 of the 83d Congress. The Committee on Appropriations, when it became obvious that the Committee on Armed Services could not complete its task during the first session of the 83d Congress, then provided a similar provision that places finite limitations on the number of officers to be promoted in the commissioned ranks from major and comparable ranks on up. But, I want to say those figures were compiled completely aside from any recommendations that I had made. So that it is not quite correct to refer to the existing legislation as the Davis amendment. As a matter of fact, they were figures which were submitted by the Armed Services themselves, as being the figures of the number of officers in those ranks that they planned to have during the course of the current fiscal year.

One further comment. In several instances in the report there is mentioned the evil of year-by-year limitations such as the Committee on Appropriations has placed in the bill for the past 2 years on these officer ranks. As far as I know, there is no member on the Committee on Appropriations who approves of this yearly limitation idea. But we on the Committee on Appropriations were confronted with a condition which we felt, and which I believe the members of the Committee on Armed Services felt, required some temporary stopgap legislation. That was the condition which led to the original Davis amendment. It was the condition which led to the provision in the 1954 appropriation act for the Department of Defense, when it became obvious that permanent legislation could not be prepared in time. We all recognize that there was a great void in the existing legislation, that with respect to the Army and Air Force there was no limitation in the law whatsoever with respect to the promotions of the officers in those services. The so-called Davis amendment and its successor, for which I can claim no credit, nor do I feel I can take any blame either, was dealing with that specific condition which then did exist. As I said, I am not in a position—this is much too technical and complicated matter for a person who is not on the Committee on Armed Services to attempt to evaluate for others the definite figures which have been included in this legislation—but I do heartily approve the approach that has been made and I compliment the subcommittee for the conscientious job they have done in bringing this legislation to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this is an extremely important bill. It is a bill that is

presented to the committee timely. It is very badly needed legislation, in my judgment, and it is very carefully considered legislation. The subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and the Armed Services Committee in its entirety both considered this measure very carefully.

This is a bill that is extremely technical. Unless you dig in and study the figures, weigh one provision of the bill against the other, you really do not get to the heart of the problem. Then when you get that far into the measure so as to study the figures in all branches of the service, you reach the conclusion that this is a real tough problem.

It is a problem that everyone would naturally expect, in any violent fluctuation in the figures of personnel in the armed services. For instance, after World War I we had a similar problem. I recall working with the old Military Affairs Committee on the problem of "the hump" created in the Army as a result of the sudden decrease in the size of the Army following World War I. We have a similar situation now in all branches of the service in the Defense Department.

I recall after World War I we found some captains in the Army who had not been promoted in almost 20 years. They had been stagnant, and the morale was very low in this service, and we did not have a very healthy condition in our Defense Department. Naturally we expected the same thing following World War II.

I am not going to explain the details of this bill. It represents a real, genuine, earnest attempt to provide a workable personnel for the branches of the armed services, permitting proper promotion from time to time of those who carry on the burden of our national defense effort.

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] performed a worthwhile service in bringing this matter promptly to the attention of the Armed Services Committee; and the committee, taking the ball, has carried on and has presented you a bill which is acceptable in every detail today and should be passed.

I do want to call attention to one matter, however, that I think is worthy of consideration. You cannot set an exact percentage in each rank as being the exact percentage needed in each branch of the armed services. The reason we cannot do that is obvious. Especially since World War II, we have adopted in this Congress, whether wisely or not, a policy of calling upon commissioned officers of our Defense Department, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps, to perform services far out and beyond the normal service which they perform in the course of their work as a member of our Defense Department. For instance, now, because of legislation provided by this Congress, the Army provides almost 4,000 officers to perform duties outside of the duties of the Army. Actually the number is 3,995 officers, who perform duties that are foreign to the work of the Armed Forces. For instance, we cover these areas: We have officers in the Joint Chiefs of Staff areas that require officer personnel; the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, that requires

personnel of the various branches of the armed services. We have Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe, which require commissioned personnel of the armed services; the military assistance advisory groups and missions and civilian agencies all over the world that require the services of commissioned officers to be taken from our Defense Establishment.

It must be remembered that the Navy, often as a result of legislation that we passed, has had to furnish 1,530 officers in other work than their regular work and necessary duty in the Navy; the Air Force, 1,512 such officers; and the Marine Corps, 718. We have here over 7,000 officers in the Military Establishment who are performing duties above and outside of the duties in the regular Military Establishment.

If sometimes we in the Congress feel that the branch of the service in which we are interested has been overstaffed with officer personnel, especially at the top level—because our legislation often calls for top-grade officers and high-ranking officers—if we feel that they are overstaffed, we can look back to our own legislation and find that we, ourselves, are partially—yes, I might even say largely—responsible for the number of officers the services require in excess of the normal number of officers to perform the arduous and responsible duties which we in the Congress provide for them to do.

That, Mr. Chairman, is about the extent of my remarks. Whether that is a good policy or not, I do not know. I think we must think about it and make a decision sometime. I do not know that it is the best policy; nonetheless, it is the policy that we have been pursuing in the past and I give it to you for what it is worth. That concludes what I have to say with reference to the measure, although I might add that I think the bill should be passed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss briefly some of the reasons why it is imperative that H. R. 7103 receive favorable consideration by this body. For purposes of illustration, I wish to discuss some of the effects the present legislation in this area, the so-called Davis amendment, could have on the officer structure of the Marine Corps. This should serve to illustrate why enlightened, permanent legislation to govern officer grade distribution for all the military services is necessary.

A brief glimpse at recent military history will serve to provide background for my remarks.

Each war, or period of hostilities, has created its own backwash of personnel problems. Typical to these postwar readjustments has been what is known as commissioned officer humps. These humps are created by one of the prime requirements, in times of great crises, for a successful military machine—vast numbers of young, highly qualified officers. With the end of actual hostilities, the services, through necessity, have retained large numbers of these wartime

combat leaders to serve as career military officers, in order to capitalize on their combat experience. This war-gained experience is a valuable asset to any military service, and is particularly so in these uncertain times. The World War II hump already has proved its value to the Marine Corps and to this country in the Korean hostilities at the Pusan perimeter, at Inchon, and at the Chosin Reservoir.

However, with the passage of years, as these officers grow older, gain more experience, and qualify for further promotion to higher grades, they begin to cause grave administrative problems. The large, homogeneous group of officers who were procured to fight World War II do not now fit conveniently into the conventional pyramidal grade structure common to normal military organizations.

The same thing occurred after the Civil War, when it was not too uncommon for an officer to serve 40 years without rising above the grade of captain. After World War I, a number of our present marine generals served 15 years as lieutenants.

Subsequent to World War II, the Congress undertook to establish a statutory career pattern for officers, in order to assure the development of a highly qualified, vigorous officer corps for the services. This resulted in the enactment of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. This law incorporates features of prescribed normal service in each grade, the concept of selecting for promotion those officers best fitted among their contemporaries, and the provision for a flexible officer grade structure. The aims of this law are to assure reasonable career opportunities for officers, and to assure the development, at reasonably young ages, of the most highly qualified colonels, generals, and admirals.

In order to move officers upward through the grade structure in accordance with the schedule inherent in this law, provision was made that in the event fewer fully qualified officers can be accommodated in a higher grade than are eligible for promotion thereto, only those best fitted officers would be promoted, and the overflow would be eliminated from the service in order to make way for the scheduled promotions of younger officers coming along behind. Officers so eliminated, either by severance or retirement, are the victims of forced attrition.

The process I have just described is an orderly process and is not necessarily complicated. It is the manner in which the officer promotion process is designed to work under normal, peacetime conditions.

Since we are concerned here with human beings, their lives, hopes, and the manner in which they earn their livelihood, we must treat them with the consideration due human beings. The normal imponderables, inherent in the human relationships herein involved, is further complicated by the manner, the terms, and the conditions under which present Marine Corps officers entered their service. Because of the recurrent emergencies occasioned by threats to the national security, which have been so common during recent history, officers

have not entered the Marine Corps in uniform, equally sized groups each year. They have been procured by thousands and by dribbles, depending upon when their services have been required, which, in turn, depended upon the varying degrees of turmoil and tension which, intermittently, have gripped the world during this century.

I have briefly described what military planners call a hump. I desire to re-emphasize that humps consist of highly qualified military officers who entered the service in large, homogeneous groups, during periods of actual war or national emergency. They are the product of our times. They comprise a valuable military asset to the national security. They represent the battle-hardened and war-experienced nucleus around which future military forces of this country will be constructed. We dare not now squander this military asset by adopting, or continuing to effect, policies or measures which reflect false economy and a short-term view of the human factors involved. The officers in this hump area have attained an equity toward promised retirement that it would be an injustice to deny them.

Aside from the rights of the individual officer, which must receive consideration, it is in the best interests of the country that the wealth of military knowledge and experience possessed by the officers comprising these humps, be banked and preserved against any future need. This can be done by the enactment of measures incorporated in H. R. 7103, which provides upper limits on the number of officers who may serve in the higher grades, while creating for the several services a reasonable latitude within which officer career management may be accomplished.

The present Davis amendment has not hurt the Marine Corps during this fiscal year. Nor would the Davis amendment seriously hurt the Marine Corps during the next fiscal year if the present limitations contained therein were continued in effect at their present numerical value. If, however, the total number of officers in the Marine Corps were reduced, and the grade limitations in the Davis amendment were reduced in direct proportion to any reduction in total officer strength, the results would be nearly catastrophic to the careers of a number of young marine officers. It is of particular concern to me, and it should be of equal concern to every Member of this body, that this disaster will strike first and hardest at Marine Corps captains, rather than at the higher grades.

It does not seem unreasonable to expect that the officer strength of the Marine Corps may be reduced as a result of the suspension of active fighting in Korea, or as a result of the New Look. Nor does it seem unreasonable to expect that proponents of the Davis amendment might advocate that "all grades receive a proportionate cut." They might well say: "Our limitation has not hurt them so far. Why not continue it proportionately?"

What would happen if this type of thinking were to prevail? I believe that the Members should know that if proportionate limitations continue to be

applied to the Marine Corps officer structure, and if the officer strength of the Marine Corps were to be reduced to 17,000 in 1956 and to 16,000 in 1957 and 1958, we can expect the following results:

The first effect would be felt in 1956, when further promotions to the grades of colonel and lieutenant colonel would be curtailed, while numerous officers then serving as lieutenant colonels would be reduced to the grade of major, and only a small percentage of the planned promotion of captains to the grade of major could be effected. Similar readjustments would occur in 1957. The effect on morale that such a reversal of the normal career cycle would have is not hard to imagine.

The actual cumulative effect of the above disruptions are much more serious. These disruptions would require that 351 out of the 450 captains due for promotion during fiscal year 1957 would have to be passed over. These officers, because they could not be promoted when due after completing 12 years of commissioned service, would be forced to leave the service in fiscal year 1958, in order to maintain the flow of promotion embodied in present law. If we discount the incalculable damage this occurrence will inflict on career attractiveness, and confine ourselves to an examination of the dollar loss to the Government this action would incur, we find that it can be very conservatively estimated at \$25,011,000. This figure approximates the monetary outlay for such items as pay, allowance for subsistence and quarters, incentive pay, and so forth, which would have been paid over a 13-year period to the 351 officers severed, and would include the \$3,370,650 severance pay, required by law to be paid to these officers on their forced separation from the service.

If the Members will compare the monetary cost—\$25 million—required to annihilate 351 Marine captains—something which only this Congress can do—with the annual cost of supporting the reasonable career plan inherent in H. R. 7103—which amounts to a maximum of \$1,250,000 during its first year only and far less thereafter—there can exist no doubt that it is not only absolutely necessary, but also financially prudent, to provide reasonable career opportunities for professional Marine officers.

In addition, the Members should be made aware that the damage we can expect during 1957 will be followed during 1958 by the prospect that an additional 331 career Marine captains will have completed 12 years of commissioned service and will have to be passed over for promotion to major and, subsequently, severed during 1959 in order to maintain normal promotion flow. This will amount to a further dollar loss to the Government of \$23,997,000, in addition to the awful loss in those intangible values, both to the individuals and to the Marine Corps, which can only be estimated. However, all these things need not happen, and, indeed, will not happen if we act now to forestall their occurrence by the adoption of H. R. 7103.

Gentlemen, the rather startling information I have just presented to you

comprises only a part of the great volume of technical information gained by the Armed Services Committee during hearings on this subject. I, for one, am absolutely certain that further pursuance of a short-term, year-to-year system of legislative limitations on the officer grade structure, will be ruinous. If such a policy would actually save money, it perhaps could be supported. Since, in fact, it results in criminal waste of highly qualified officer personnel, while demanding the addition of millions of dollars to the Federal budget for the next few years, the short-term policy reflected by the Davis amendment must be permanently abandoned.

It is the duty of this body to know and to evaluate the military officer personnel needs of our country. It then is our further duty to translate those needs into legislation which reasonably may be expected to provide the military forces with officers in the quantity, as well as the quality, required for national security. I believe that H. R. 7103 goes far toward providing for the legitimate requirements for officers in each of our military services. It therefore merits your favorable consideration.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, we owe a great debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]. I think it is safe to say that if it had not been for his efforts and devotion to duty this bill would not be before us here today.

I would also like to congratulate our most learned counsel, J. Russell Blandford, who has written a splendid, well-rounded, and comprehensive report explaining the bill and who has worked diligently and tirelessly on this measure for almost a year; also the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] for their contributions to this legislation.

Complicated as this legislation is, the issues it presents are extremely simple. We can take our choice between two kinds of officer corps in our armed services. If we enact this legislation we will not be offering any careers on a silver platter, but we will be setting up a framework for career opportunities which will be a challenge to the best of our young men. Or, we can refuse to pass this legislation, make the matter of officer promotions an issue every year, and expect to procure our officer corps on a short-term basis, stimulated only by threat of the draft. But let us recognize right now that if we legislate on the short-term basis it will cost us more money for lower quality.

I happen to believe that national security demands that our Armed Forces have officers who are professionals and who are dedicated to national defense as their lifework. We are spending billions on weapons. We need enthusiastic, intelligent minds to direct the use of those weapons.

The Navy presents a good example of the implications of this issue. Historically, in the peacetime Navy most of the officers have been career officers. They

have been measured by tough standards, to make sure that we have a nucleus which in time of war can be spread thin. The apparatus of modern naval warfare requires a solid core of experts.

Competition is built into the Navy promotion system, and it is competition among regulars. An officer is not allowed to settle back and decide that he has gone far enough for comfort. Officers who are not selected for promotion when they are due are out of active service. Because there are not nearly as many jobs at the top as there are at the bottom—only the best survive.

Even in this tough league, young men have accepted the challenge. They were willing to take their chances because they knew the chances they faced. The Navy could plan ahead and spread the opportunities for promotion fairly. But recently we have been reminding these young men, and all those who are coming along, that we will review the bidding every year.

In the Navy, remember, changing the prospects for promotion does not mean merely a little longer period of waiting. It means that the same number of officers must compete for a reduced number of vacancies. It means more losers, and the career of every loser comes to a dead end. The biggest loser is the United States Government—loser by immediate outlay for severance pay or, in some cases, retirement pay, and loser of a much larger investment in training and experience. And how many young men will accept a hopeless situation as a lifetime prospect?

Why, you might ask, should there be any effect on promotions when the actual numbers in the current limitation are numbers taken directly from the Navy plans? There is no such effect on promotions this year. But none of us can give any guaranty that such an innocuous procedure will hold every year for the future.

Actually, these apparently harmless limitations this year have dynamite in them. If we should assume that this proportionate distribution is correct for every year, and can be applied to any strength of the officer corps we would run into disaster very quickly. In the very near future we would be losing 60 to 80 percent of the officers coming up to the promotion points in various grades.

There are two reasons why the long-range problem cannot be solved by a simple formula. One reason is that our huge procurement of officers during the war, many of whom became career officers, has left us with large groups of officers of nearly the same seniority. To absorb and spread these humps the promotion plans of the Navy, for instance, must make allowances from time to time to prevent wholesale losses of these valuable officers. It is a long-range problem which requires administrative elbow-room. The other reason is that in the nature of things the proportion of senior officers in a reduced establishment is larger than in an expanded service. The long-range plans must recognize this phenomenon.

A second element in the legislation now before us involves voluntary retire-

ment. The last two appropriation bills have prevented voluntary retirement in the armed services. In the years that lie ahead of us a continuation of this annual restriction on voluntary retirement would work against this country's best interest.

The recruiting incentive of voluntary retirement is known to all of us. Retirement after 20 years service has been as popular in the public mind as "Join the Navy and see the world" yet those officers who have sought voluntary retirement upon completing 20 years are so few as to be negligible. Only one-half of 1 percent of the officers completing 20 to 25 years service have retired voluntarily. Only 2½ percent of the officers completing 25 to 30 years commissioned service have retired voluntarily. While the thought of retirement looms large in the minds of most officers few officers desire to avail themselves when the time comes.

Voluntary retirement has always been a strong incentive for a young man to select the Navy as a career. When he later becomes eligible for such retirement he seldom avails himself of it. Yet when that retirement is denied, the incentive which it provides terminates. The history of voluntary retirement shows that it provides a recruiting incentive of great proportion, while the use actually made of the benefit is extremely small.

It should be noted that even when an officer does retire voluntarily it is not a case of an additional retirement from the Navy. The narrowing of the command pyramid in its ascending grades requires the separation of officers in each grade annually. The voluntary retirement of one officer substitutes his separation from the service for that of an officer who would otherwise be involuntarily separated. The result is that two officers obtain what they desire—one retiring who desires to and another remaining on active duty who desires to—rather than each being denied what he wishes.

We have everything to gain and nothing to lose through regulating promotions and retirement in long-range legislation rather than annual legislation. The bill now before us provides an able means of doing this.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly endorse the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

This is one of the most important subjects this session of the Congress will consider, since the bill before the House deals with the careers of the men who now lead our Armed Forces and whom you will expect to bring victory to this Nation in the event of a third world war.

While this is a very technical subject, nevertheless what is involved here really boils down to a few simple propositions. The problem, as I see it, is to enact into law something that should have been contained in the Officer Personnel Act of

1947. I think we were a little bit too optimistic in 1947 when we didn't impose ceilings on temporary promotions for the Army and the Air Force and when we imposed the same ceilings in the Navy and Marine Corps for temporary promotions that are applicable to permanent promotions. This bill solves that problem on a sliding-scale basis. It is based on the simple proposition that as the number of officers on active duty increases the proportion of senior officers to the total number of officers decreases. And it also works the other way—that is, as the total number of officers on active duty decreases the number of senior officers likewise decreases although the proportion will be higher because the basic organization does not change.

On November 30, 1953, we had an Army of 1,500,634 men and women; of this number 8.5 percent were commissioned officers. In other words, we had 128,138 commissioned officers in the Army on active duty.

In the Air Force, on November 30, 1953, we had 923,917 men and women; 12.85 percent were officers. We had a total of 118,742 Air Force officers on active duty.

In the Navy, on that same date, we had 771,367 men and women on active duty and 9.8 percent were officers, for a total commissioned officer strength of 75,623.

In the Marine Corps we had a total of 252,607 men and women on active duty of which 7.07 percent were officers. We had a total of 17,848 officers on active duty in the Marine Corps.

Thus, you can see that the ratio of officers to enlisted personnel varies with the highest ratio being in the Air Force and the lowest in the Marine Corps.

Now, what do all of these officers do? Well, it would take me many weeks to explain to this House the multitude of assignments which these officers fill, but basically they lead the young men of our Nation who are a part of our Armed Forces. And our Armed Forces, whether we like it or not, are only as good as the officers who lead them.

Many of these officers are performing duties not directly related to their own particular branch of the service. They are performing duties which you and I have imposed upon them as the result of many different acts of Congress. They are overseeing the spending of billions of dollars, they are assisting the free nations in preparing their defenses—but all of them are working for one common goal—the defense of America and the preservation of freedom everywhere.

So when we whittle away at our officer corps, we whittle away at the backbone of our defense structure.

Now, the other simple proposition involved in this bill is that of enacting permanent legislation on this matter of temporary promotions which will remove the uncertainty and the confusion and sometimes serious mistakes that otherwise inevitably occur when another Committee in an honest effort to put on the brakes gets wrong information because it has been hastily supplied.

We all recall the first Davis amendment in the 1953 Defense Appropriations Act which could have forced the actual

demotion of some 5,000 senior lieutenants in the Navy. That was a mistake on the part of the Navy but it was a mistake that I think we can all well understand. The Navy was requested to supply figures on a very rapid basis and those figures turned out to be wrong. Congress remedied the situation but the effect upon the morale of officers everywhere in our Armed Forces undoubtedly was quite serious.

Now, this bill will remove that uncertainty and it will let the armed services plan their promotions on a reasonable basis, looking into the future, without the necessity of facing a numerical limitation each year, based upon what each session of the Congress may consider to be a proper distribution.

We just cannot operate a career system any other way. It is all right to control the money; it is all right to limit funds for pay; but let the services live within the money limitation with the flexibility necessary to preserve this most complex, but extremely necessary promotion system.

Now the other side of this problem deals with possible undesirable consequences. Here I have to resort to conjecture because if we do not pass this bill, I do not know what numerical limitation the Appropriations Committee may place in the next appropriation act for the officer distribution among the armed services. And that is the big problem. What worries me and what worries the armed services, and particularly the young officers who are considering making the armed services a career, is the possibility that the Congress will say that the numerical limitation which was imposed in this year's appropriation act did no harm so, therefore, we will use that as a basis for a numerical limitation in the next appropriation act, reducing those numbers as the total size of the armed services reduces in size. Or increasing the number of officers, in the case of the Air Force, in proportion to the increase contemplated for the Air Force. The point is we cannot use the Davis amendment as a basis for future adjustments upwards and downwards. It just is not that simple.

But if the Congress should insist upon these numerical limitations and should the Congress use the Davis amendment as a basis for future numerical limitations then I want to tell you right here and now that there are going to be pretty serious consequences flowing from that action. If we do that, then we are going to have a forced separation of a fantastic number of regular officers in the Navy and Marine Corps and a forced separation of many reservists now serving on continuous active duty in the Army and Air Force. The cost will be staggering not only in the financial benefits which will be paid to these regular officers, but also in the loss of trained manpower. I want to make that point clear because as complicated as this subject is, I think every Member should be aware of the results that might take place if the legislation should fail.

Now, I want to say this in all seriousness to the Appropriations Committee and to the gentleman from Wisconsin—no one has been hurt in the Armed

Forces under the present limitation contained in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1954. No one has been denied promotion yet. The figures that are the present limitations were given to the gentleman from Wisconsin, or to his subcommittee, by the armed services themselves and as a result no one has been hurt. But that does not remove the uncertainty in the minds of young men who point to this limitation as the reason why they will not make the armed services a career. They simply do not want to enter a career subject to the unpredictable limitations that may be imposed by each successive session of Congress. It is as simple as that.

Now, there are some among you who are going to look at the charts in the report—and I want to say that we have tried to present the entire picture in the report so no one can accuse us of holding back information, but someone is going to say, "Why have not the services promoted to the limitations now contained in the Davis amendment?" This is true as of now, but if you will look at the charts, you will see that all of the services except the Navy do plan to have a grade distribution on June 30 of this year approximately the same as that permitted under the Davis amendment.

The reason why the Navy is not going to the limitations contained in the Davis amendment is due to the fact that the numbers supplied to the Appropriations Committee were based on an average strength, but in conference the limitation was made effective as against an end strength. The Davis amendment does not go into effect until the last quarter of this fiscal year.

Now, some of you are going to say that this bill would permit a higher grade distribution than that which the armed services proposes to have on June 30, 1954. That also is true, but I do not think we can overemphasize the fact that the proposed legislation is aimed at taking into consideration all of the various complicated situations that must arise under the promotion system.

In other words, as people move up in grade and as they complete years of service they become eligible for promotion and they must be considered for promotion and either promoted or eliminated. Unfortunately, we do not have that nice balance that would be so highly desirable that permits an even flow of men each year. Wars, emergencies, increases and decreases in the strength of our Armed Forces, integration programs, and all of the other factors involved in our complex international situation prevent that.

So the bill must take into consideration all of those possibilities and likelihoods, even though there will be many years, on this sliding-scale system, when the services will not promote to the ceilings established in this bill.

Now remember that word "ceiling" because that is what this bill imposes on this grade-distribution system. It is not an authorization; it is not a mandate to the services to promote to the figures permitted in this bill; it is a ceiling beyond which they cannot promote. And the services are just as anxious to avoid an awkward unbalanced grade distribu-

tion as you are because they have to live with the problem every day. They have the careers of these officers in their hands, and they know how important a reasonable and normal flow of promotion is to maintaining morale in our Armed Forces.

Now someone may say, "Well, your whole distribution system is based upon officer strength; why is it not based upon total strength? Why do not you write a bill that will permit a certain number of officers in each grade depending upon the total number of persons serving on active duty in each of our Armed Forces?" The answer is simple. It would be unrealistic to man the services within a fixed ratio of officers to enlisted men. How could any bill be written basing distribution upon total strength and try to take into consideration the type of decrease or increase which might be effected in the years to come? For example, in the present expansion of the Air Force, as more wings are placed in operation, the number of officers required to man those wings increases out of proportion to the total increase in strength. In an operating wing you need more officers because you have pilots, copilots, navigators, and all of the other technical persons necessary to make an operating wing effective.

Suppose we reduced the Army by four divisions. The number of officers required to man a division is less in proportion to the enlisted strength than in the overall strength in the Army because those are the men who are manning basic weapons. But just because you decrease by 4 divisions does not necessarily mean that you will decrease the number of officers required in the technical services to provide for the 16 remaining divisions. It may be just as easy for 1 officer to be charged with the responsibility for shipping supplies to 20 divisions as for 16 divisions. So you see you could not base a distribution of officers on total strength because you would never know where the decrease or increase in total strength would take place. If it takes place in technical services, you could decrease your officers. But if it takes place in the combat forces alone, then the number of officers will not be decreased in proportion to the contemplated decrease in total strength.

Now, someone is probably going to ask, "Well, why do you talk about career planning and a normal flow of promotion when there are so many officers already serving in 1 or 2 temporary grades above their permanent grades? Is not this forced separation of Regulars limited to permanent promotions?"

The answer to that question is fundamental to this whole problem. It involves requirements—that is—the grade spread considered necessary to properly carry out the missions assigned to each service. It also involves the whole promotion system.

I think no one seriously disagrees with the principle that a laborer is worthy of his hire. And, following that principle, I think we can all agree that an officer is entitled to the grade and pay that goes with the responsibility he is asked to assume. That is why we give him a

promotion, and then give him added responsibility. That promotion may be a temporary one if the service has increased to such an extent that more officers are needed to do the jobs that must be done. But, in some cases, those promotions are ahead of schedule—that is—Regular and Reserve officers are advanced in grade ahead of the time they normally would receive a permanent promotion. And that is a temporary promotion.

Now, on the other hand, we have to analyze the different promotion systems because if a Regular officer fails to get a temporary promotion in the Army or the Air Force, no penalty is extracted from him. In other words, it is not considered a passover.

But in the Navy and Marine Corps, if a Regular officer fails of selection to a temporary grade under the Officer Personnel Act, he does pay a penalty, because after the second failure of selection he must be forcibly separated or retired.

Now, in the Army and the Air Force, Regular officers must be promoted to permanent grades, if they are qualified, even though no vacancies exist. In other words, after 7 years of service, a Regular officer, if qualified, must be promoted to permanent captain; after 14 years he must be promoted to permanent major; and after 21 years, he must be promoted to permanent lieutenant colonel. And here we run into the danger of a limitation such as that contained in the Defense Appropriation Act, because if the limitation is too small, these officers must be promoted and other officers serving in that temporary grade must be demoted, or additional career reservists must be forced off active duty.

In the Marine Corps, Regular officers must be considered for promotion to major after 12 years of service, but if no vacancy exists, or if the vacancies are so small that only a few can be promoted, then a heavy forced separation must take place.

This same situation is true in the grades of lieutenant, lieutenant commander, and commander in the Navy.

That is why we are so concerned about career planning.

Now some one may say this limitation is fine, but why does it not include captains and lieutenants? It stops at majors, or their equivalent. Well, again the answer is simple. A great many of the officers on active duty in the services are in the grades of lieutenant and captain and if we tried to impose limitations on a sliding scale basis we would be forcing these officers either to lower grades or we would be compelling them to assume the responsibility of a captain or a first lieutenant without giving them the right to serve in the grade and to draw the pay of a captain or first lieutenant. We have a large number of these officers in this position today, and we don't want to make the situation worse. We are going to have to use reservists in large numbers for the foreseeable future, and I do not think we want to pass a law that will penalize these young officers even though their promotions to those grades will be a little faster than would normally be expected

under the theory of the Officer Personnel Act. We make an exception in those cases and rightfully so. The only effect of a sliding scale system below the grade of major would be to seriously hurt a large number of reserve officers now serving on active duty and those who will enter on active duty in the future. These are the officers who live with their men daily and who assume the responsibilities of company commanders, platoon leaders, and executive officers of companies, and they are entitled to the pay and grade of the responsibility they must assume.

Now I would like to mention one other feature of this bill and that is the provision which authorizes the suspension of the proposed law in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the President or the Congress. Why is this in the bill? Well, the answer again is simple. If we go to war or we have an all-out emergency short of war we are going to call a lot of reservists to active duty and they will be entering in all grades. It would be absolutely impossible to operate in the early stages of such a war or emergency on a sliding scale system such as that proposed in this bill.

But in something short of a national emergency or total war, the bill provides that the sliding scale system will apply even though the total officer strength exceeds the tables in the proposed legislation. In other words, the sliding scale system which envisions a proportional decrease in senior officers as the total number of officers on active duty increases will continue even beyond the tables in the proposed bill unless the Congress or the President declares a national emergency or unless the Congress declares a war. It is simply a question of degree. But in writing permanent legislation, we have got to take into consideration all possibilities.

Now, let us take a look at just what this bill will do in the case of the Air Force.

On November 30, 1953, there were 113,742 commissioned officers of the Air Force on active duty. That is every single commissioned officer. At that time there were 7 generals, 20 lieutenant generals, 130 major generals, and 214 brigadier generals, or a total of 371 general officers.

Now the planned end-strength contemplated by the Air Force for June 30 of this year involves 9 generals, 23 lieutenant generals, 152 major generals, and 244 brigadier generals, for a total of 428 general officers. Now, that is what the Davis limitation permits in exactly that grade distribution. Now, what would our bill do for generals?

Well, the Air Force intends to have 130,799 commissioned officers on active duty on June 30 of this year. So if we look at the table in the bill we will see that for a strength of 130,799 commissioned officers, the Air Force would be permitted to have a total of 435 general officers. That is 7 more general officers than the Davis amendment permits and 7 more general officers than the budget permits. Obviously they would not immediately promote 7 colonels to brigadier generals, because they prefer to stay within the budget estimates, but if it be-

came necessary for the proper operation of the Air Force they could have 7 more general officers.

Now, you will notice in the report that the charts for the Air Force show that under our bill for a strength of 130,799 officers in the Air Force there could be 9 generals, 23 lieutenant generals, 185 major generals, and 218 brigadier generals. Actually, our bill does not limit the number of lieutenant generals and generals since those are the positions of importance designated by the President. But our bill does provide that not more than 50 percent of the general officers may be serving above the grade of brigadier general. Now that is the normal distribution for such officers and is similar in that respect to the Navy law which provides that half of the rear admirals of the unrestricted line can be rear admirals of the upper half.

We do not attempt in our bill to spell out the number of generals and lieutenant generals that each service may have since those are positions to be designated by the President. Insofar as money is concerned for four-star generals and lieutenant generals, it amounts to practically nothing because the basic pay, subsistence, and quarters allowance for a general or admiral or a lieutenant general or vice admiral is the same as that for a major general. The only difference is that a lieutenant general or a vice admiral gets a special allowance of \$500 a year and a full general or a full admiral gets an allowance of \$2,200 a year.

The sum and substance of what I have said amounts to this: under our bill on June 30, 1954, for 130,799 officers, the Air Force would be allowed to have 435 general officers, of whom 50 percent could be serving in the grades above brigadier general. That is 7 more than what the Davis amendment permits for the same officer strength. The Air Force grade structure for general officers is based upon requirements, and we think those requirements have been justified.

Now in the next fiscal year, the Air Force plans to have 137,788 commissioned officers on active duty on June 30, 1955. Their budget estimates contemplate 9 generals, 23 lieutenant generals, 157 major generals, and 259 brigadier generals. Under our bill they could have 224 brigadier generals and 224 officers serving above the grade of brigadier general. But in both cases, under the budget estimate and under our bill, the Air Force would be limited to a ceiling of 448 general officers.

Now in the grade of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major, the situation is different. On November 30, 1953, the Air Force had 4,250 colonels. They plan to have 4,349 colonels on June 30, 1954, and the Davis limitation permits them to have 4,349 colonels. The reason for that is that the Davis amendment was based upon the budget estimates presented to the Appropriations Committee. And the Air Force has not altered its promotion plans for this fiscal year. Now under our bill, however, for the same total strength in officers, that is, 130,799 officers, the Air Force would be permitted to have 5,290 colonels. That is 941 more colonels than the budget estimate and the Davis

limitation permits. This is based upon requirements and on the whole theory of promotion which we have been discussing here today. It does not mean that the Air Force will promote 941 lieutenant colonels, but it does mean that at some date in the future it may be necessary, and if funds are available it would be desirable, to have 5,290 colonels for an officer strength in the Air Force of 130,799 officers.

Now on lieutenant colonels, the ceiling for June 30, 1954, exceeds by 2,375 the number now contained in the Davis limitation. Likewise, it exceeds by 3,025 the number of majors permitted under the Davis limitation. And all the reasons that have been given today apply with even greater force to these grades.

The Air Force budget estimates for June 30, 1955, contemplate 4,806 colonels out of a total number of 137,788 officers while our ceiling based on that number of officers on active duty would be 5,437 colonels. This is based upon requirements and the eventual projected promotions necessary to maintain career planning that has already been discussed here today.

On June 30, 1955, the Air Force contemplates having 9,100 lieutenant colonels, whereas our bill would establish a ceiling of 11,230 lieutenant colonels. On June 30, 1955, the Air Force plans to have 22,385 majors, whereas our bill would establish a ceiling of 25,153 majors. I want to repeat that what our bill establishes as a ceiling will not, and should not, be construed as an authorization, but is based upon requirements and the desirability of some day attaining that grade distribution if funds are available, for the proper manning of the Air Force, and in order to maintain the long-range career planning that we are discussing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services, acting together as always, has worked hard on this bill, as the printed hearings will show. We believe we have solved the problem which has necessitated action by the Appropriations Committee for the past 2 years, and we hope that this will make unnecessary any future attempts to impose numerical limitations on temporary promotions. It permits long-range planning and avoids the confusion and uncertainty that is the inevitable result of a numerical limitation imposed every year. I hope that the Members of this House will react favorably to this bill and will appreciate the work that has gone into the development of this bill. It was written by the committee, not the Department of Defense. And we think we have done a good job.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is sound, constructive, and necessary. The details of the measure have been fully explained by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and by my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. As has been pointed out, the measure we now have before us is the result of weeks of study, hearings, and preparation. Most of the credit for that goes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and the gentleman from Texas

[Mr. KILDAY]. In addition, Mr. Blanford, the staff member of the Committee on Armed Services, did his usual brilliant work in getting this bill prepared and processed for presentation here. Mr. Bob Short, clerk and counsel for the committee, likewise contributed greatly to the measure and is entitled to a lot of credit.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose to be served by this bill is to impose statutory limitations on the number of officers who may serve in the grades of major and above, or their equivalent, on active duty in the armed services, and, as pointed out in the report, to repeal two provisions of the 1954 Defense Appropriation Act which deals with promotion and retirement. The bill deals primarily with the subject of temporary promotions.

There has been much confusion on these subjects in recent years. This has been bad for morale, and corrective legislation is overdue. This bill should remove much of that confusion and enable the armed services to have a better understanding of their rights and just what they have a right to expect in matters of promotion. It should be promptly enacted.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I just want primarily to congratulate and commend the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] for the tireless effort he has put into this legislation. It was a very difficult piece of legislation, and he has worked hard and diligently on it. Those of us on this side of the aisle tried to help him as best we could, but it was a difficult job, a very technical job. I think we have brought in a good bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped, in 1947, that never again would it be necessary for me to stand in the well of this House and try to explain the complexities—the almost staggering intricacies—the fantastically complicated promotion system which became the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. That act established a system of promotion in our Armed Forces aimed at reducing excessive forced separation, and at the same time permitting reasonable promotion of officers in competition with their fellow officers, throughout the various grades from lieutenant to general. It envisioned a normal career for a young officer who would serve a certain number of years in each grade and then in competition with officers of his same class would be advanced, if qualified, to the next higher grade. In the process, some would leave the service because of their failure to be selected; others would resign; and death and disability would overtake others. All told, the law, in general terms, was intended to provide a sound basis for career planning for officers in our Armed Forces. It established specific percentages with respect to the number of regular officers who could serve in permanent grades in each of the various grades. Basically, it was

intended to meet the needs of a normal peacetime armed force, although the act took into consideration the fact that for some years to come there would have to be certain adjustments, and thus provisions for temporary promotions were also authorized.

Now there is where the problem has arisen—in the field of temporary promotions. The Officer Personnel Act does not place a ceiling upon the number of officers who may serve in temporary grades in the Army and Air Force. And while there are percentage ceilings on the number of officers who may serve in temporary grades in the Navy and Marine Corps it is obvious that those ceilings are far too liberal, and as a result cannot be considered to be restrictive.

It was, for that reason, I am sure, that the Appropriations Committee saw fit to impose numerical limitations on the number of officers who could serve in the grade of captain and above in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1953. However, in hastily supplying figures to the Appropriations Committee, the Navy made a very grievous mistake and as a result the Defense Appropriation Act of 1953 could have forced the actual demotion of some 5,000 naval senior lieutenants. When this matter was brought to our attention we prepared legislation to remedy the situation and the Congress very quickly and very generously enacted that legislation into law.

Then in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1954 the Appropriations Committee again saw fit to impose numerical limitations on the number of officers who could serve in the grade of major and above, or their equivalent, in the Armed Forces.

Now the figures that are contained in the present so-called Davis amendment were supplied by each of the armed services and to date those limitations have not worked a hardship upon any officer in the armed services. In other words, I wish to make it clear at the outset that no one has yet been hurt, this year, as a result of the numerical limitations contained in the Defense Appropriation Act.

And I also want to say this—the Committee on Armed Services has been aware for some time of the lack of adequate statutory limitations on temporary promotions. While we are opposed to limitations in appropriation acts which disrupt orderly planning, nevertheless the so-called Davis limitations, in the last two appropriation acts, have brought to the attention of this House the necessity for legislation such as that which we propose here today.

There is a definite need for ceilings on temporary promotions and we think that we have prepared legislation which will answer those who have been critical of the lack of limitations on temporary promotions.

Now one thing must be kept clear in mind throughout this debate; this is permanent law. So long as there are Reserve officers on active duty in the Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Army, there will be a need for temporary promotions—and from what I can observe we are going to have to maintain an

Armed Force in the neighborhood of 3 million men for a long time to come.

So what we have done is prepare legislation which will approach the requirements of the services and at the same time establish ceilings on temporary promotions which will meet all reasonable situations.

The objection to a yearly numerical limitation is that it disrupts long-range planning, and may, under some circumstances, bring about the undesirable consequences of excessive loss of trained officer personnel as well as considerable financial loss.

When I refer to the objections to a yearly numerical limit, I am referring to the possibility that in the future, as the Armed Forces decrease in size, the so-called Davis amendment may be used as the basis for downward adjustment for officer strength. If you will read the report, you will see how such a possibility, if put into effect, could have rather devastating results.

I will not attempt to explain the promotion systems now in effect for each of the armed services, except to say that the Army and Air Force have one system and the Navy and Marine Corps have another system. And within the Navy there is even the more complicated procedure of the so-called running-mate system which applies to the several staff corps of the Navy. In the Army and Air Force Regular officers must be considered for promotion and promoted if qualified after a specific number of years of service in each grade. In the Navy there are normal years of service in grade, upon the completion of which officers must be considered for promotion or forcibly separated.

If we should attempt to legislate from year to year and establish numerical limitations beyond which the services could not promote, and if we use the present limitations contained in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1954 as the basis of adjustment as the size of the Armed Forces decreases, I can assure you that you will have forced attrition in the Navy and Marine Corps which will be heavier than anything ever heretofore experienced. If you will read the report, you will get a pretty clear picture of what could take place.

Now bear in mind that we are trying to pass permanent legislation which will solve this problem for years to come. It does not follow that the ceilings that are contained in this proposed legislation will be attained each year. It is important to keep that in mind. At the same time I think it must also be remembered that there will be years, in the future, particularly for the Navy and Marine Corps, when the ceilings contained in this proposed law will be attained, because that is the way your promotion system operates.

For example, in fiscal 1956, there will be a certain number of captains in the Marine Corps who will complete 12 years of total service. They must then be considered for promotion to major. If the limitations then in effect on the grade of major are based on the present Davis amendment and adjusted downward if the Marine Corps total strength decreases in size, the Marine Corps will be

required to consider, for promotion, a large number of officers and put into effect an attrition rate that may be as high as 78 percent. Now keep that in mind. Under certain circumstances, if we were to project the Davis limitation into the future for the Marine Corps, decreased as the size of the Marine Corps decreases, then 78 captains out of every hundred eligible for consideration for promotion to major must fail of selection and the following year, upon the second failure of selection, which again would be required because of the lack of vacancies, those officers would be separated from the service and paid severance pay. That severance pay would amount to 2 months' pay for each year of service not to exceed a total of 2 years' pay. Think of the cost involved. And think of the loss of trained manpower. Think what it costs to train an officer today—think what it costs to train a pilot, and bear in mind that some of them would be pilots, and then remember that unless we have a reasonable flow of promotion and reasonable limitations such as are proposed in this bill, we might bring about that fantastic attrition rate.

If the Davis amendment is projected into the future and the grade distribution is decreased as the size of the Navy is decreased then the attrition or forced separation rates for promotion from senior lieutenant to lieutenant commander, lieutenant commander to commander, and commander to captain will increase by 100 percent—from 25 per 100 to 50 per 100.

Now there will be some who will suggest that this will not be necessary because all the Navy and Marine Corps have to do is to release reservists in those grades to make room for those Regulars who must be promoted. The answer to that, of course, is that that will have to be done even under the proposed legislation. But there will not be enough Reserve officers on active duty in the higher grades to supply these vacancies.

Now it must be remembered that in the Marine Corps and Navy only 50 percent of the officers are reservists, with a large number of those reservists serving in the junior grades. So there may be a very heavy attrition rate, or forced separation rate, extracted in the Navy and Marine Corps among the Regular officers if we do not enact legislation which will establish reasonable ceilings. Even if the present limitations were continued as they now are—without change—the attrition rate would increase substantially.

In the Army and Air Force the situation is somewhat different. Here 80 percent of the officers are reservists and even under the proposed legislation, which is restrictive, some reservists will have to be released to inactive duty. The Army and the Air Force will not apply heavy attrition rates against their Regulars since there are a sufficient number of permanent promotions available for the next few years to absorb the promotion of Regular officers to permanent grades. And failure of selection to a temporary grade in the Army and Air Force does not carry with it the penalty of forced separation after two passovers. But I think we must realize that if we

impose numerical limitations which are unduly restrictive and are below the requirements for the Army and Air Force that eventually when officers in the Army and Air Force are considered for permanent promotion those who are Regulars must be promoted and those who are reservists will have to be released to make room for the Regulars. Thus, if the present limitations contained in the Defense Appropriations Act of 1954 are projected into the future and decreased proportionally as the size of the Army decreases, it eventually will be the Reserve officer in most instances who will be forcibly separated and not the Regular officer. And, the bulk of the Army and Air Force officers are reservists—many of them career reservists. Obviously, as the armed services decrease in size, Reserve officers must be released. But the forced release will be much heavier if the Davis amendment is used as a basis for future proportionate decreases.

Now what I have said indicates what the consequences will be if we should continue in the future to impose numerical limitations on a year-to-year basis. That is why the proposed legislation imposes reasonable ceilings which will permit the services to carry out long-range promotion plans based upon normal career planning and actual requirements. In addition, the ceilings must be sufficiently large to take into consideration the advancement in grade of large numbers of integrated Reserve officers who performed so outstandingly in World War II and later qualified for Regular commissions.

These men who were given regular commissions in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force have created so-called humps. That is, these officers, who are about the same age and who have about the same amount of total service and who are serving in approximately the same grade, all become eligible for promotion at about the same time. If our ceilings are too restrictive, then we forcibly separate or retire an excessive number of these people in any given year in the Navy and Marine Corps, or forcibly separate a well-qualified reservist in the Army and Air Force. The following year, based upon the same number of total officers in the services, it is possible that the ceiling will be larger than is necessary for that particular year. But a year or two after that, unless the ceiling is sufficiently large, we again run into the situation of having officers in about the same age groups with the same length of service moving up for promotion as required by law and being forcibly separated because of an unduly restrictive ceiling.

I realize that all of this is extremely confusing and very complex, but I must tell you some of the highlights of the promotion system so you will understand why it is so important to enact long-range legislation. To actually describe the whole system in detail would take more time than is practical under the circumstances.

Let me say this: The Committee on Armed Services strongly favors reasonable limitations on temporary promotions to fill a void that now exists in the

Officer Personnel Act. But those ceilings have got to be large enough to take care of all of the peculiar situations which inevitably arise in a promotion system. If we were at peace, and had been at peace for many years, we could balance the input of officers with those who are leaving the service. We could maintain a constant flow with certain arrangements for those who exceed the anticipated normal attrition rates. But, unfortunately, in the last 14 years this Nation has had to respond to wars, full emergencies, limited emergencies, and countless other international situations which has not allowed us the luxury of maintaining a stable armed force for any period of time.

At the end of World War II when it became necessary to increase the number of Regular officers in the Armed Forces we naturally turned to the reservists then serving on active duty as a source for our Regular officers. And when Korea came we again turned to our Reserve officers to fill the requirements for officers brought about by that situation. And we realize that for many years in the future it will be necessary to keep reservists on active duty. At the same time it will be necessary to integrate Reserve officers into our Regular forces. As a result, these humps to which I have referred will not eventually disappear, they will constantly reoccur in the entire promotion system from second lieutenant to general. And unless this Congress is willing to publicly state that the reservists now on active duty are expendable in order to save dollars, then we must provide a promotion system that will give them the consideration to which they are entitled.

Now I want to say this in connection with this whole matter: This is not a Department of Defense measure and it has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. I do not think the Department of Defense or the Bureau of the Budget gave any formal approval to the limitations now contained in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1954, and we did not think it was necessary to get their approval to remove these limitations and impose a sliding-scale system such as that proposed here today. This bill was written by a subcommittee and then rewritten by the full Committee on Armed Services with the assistance of the four military services. The services approved this bill because they realized and hoped, as we do, that it will remove the necessity for imposing numerical limitations in each successive appropriation act. The bill will permit the planning to which I refer and it will let young men know what their futures hold if they enter the services on a career basis. As it is today they only know that they are subject to the whims and caprices of the Congress, and they are not sure that they will ever be promoted. You cannot expect a young man to buy a pig in a poke—not in this day and age.

Now, I know that some of you are going to say, "Well, let us compare the present distribution of officers with the distribution that was in effect during World War II." Well, we might do that, or we might compare it with the Span-

ish-American War or the Boxer Rebellion. To me, a comparison of World War II grade distribution with present distribution or that proposed in this bill is like comparing average incomes of Government workers in 1945 with the average incomes of Government workers today. But there is more to it than just a comparison of incomes. I think if the Congress is going to compare a World War II grade distribution with that proposed in this bill, or that now in existence, then the Congress had also better ask itself how many additional assignments it has given the armed services over and above their regular missions.

These figures are all in the report. You need only read that to see where some of your generals, your colonels, your lieutenant colonels, and your majors are serving; you need think only of unification and the creation of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe; you need think only of the military missions and groups that are scattered all over the world; you need think only of the commitments, the treaties, and the agreements that this country has with respect to the defense of the free world to answer the question why we cannot compare World War II grade distribution with present-day distribution or those proposed in this bill.

Could you expect a major in the Army, representing the United States to do business with a general in the French Army? Do you want an ensign representing the United States on a commission where the British have an admiral? Those are the problems we give the armed services who must then supply the officers that are requested for these myriad missions. The armed services did not ask for them. We imposed those assignments on the Armed Forces. The Congress created the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Congress is responsible for the aid programs that are now in effect throughout the world. And when the Department of State or any other agency or department asks the armed services to designate an officer to represent his service or the United States in a military mission or in an assistance group, they want a senior officer, not a young lieutenant or a captain. So keep that in mind if you insist upon a comparison with World War II distribution. And keep in mind that Congress passed the Officer Personnel Act that set up this career planning; that abolished the idea that existed in the 1920's and 1930's that an officer would serve 16 or 17 years in grade before being promoted. We realized, in 1947, that we were not going to have an armed force made up of the type men we wanted unless we made the services reasonably attractive from a promotion viewpoint. So the Congress passed that law. And we must assume that Congress approved the theory of the Officer Personnel Act—the law under which men have since entered the Armed Forces to make the service a career.

We must not forget that we are dealing with a different type of overall strategy today. The weapons of world war

III will be as different as World War II weapons were in comparison with World War I weapons. And you do not get technicians, electronics specialists, radar experts, engineers, guided-missiles experts, and other specialists by offering them commissions as an ensign or second lieutenant with the understanding that it will be a long time before they get promoted.

Now these are some of the practical problems that are involved in this whole situation. And that is why these ceilings contained in this bill exceed those now authorized for June 30 of this year in the present Davis amendment.

Now let us look at this situation.

In the Army, for example, the proposed legislation will permit 19 more general officers than the present Davis amendment; it will permit 290 more full colonels, 570 more lieutenant colonels and 1,365 more majors. In the Navy, the proposed legislation would permit 22 more flag officers, 1,600 more captains, 176 fewer commanders, and 1,475 more lieutenant commanders. In the Marine Corps the proposed legislation would authorize as a ceiling on June 30, 1954, the same number of general officers, but 176 more full colonels, 165 more lieutenant colonels, and 481 more majors. In the Air Force, the proposed legislation would permit on June 30, 1954, 7 more general officers, 941 more colonels, 2,375 more lieutenant colonels, and 3,025 more majors than that allowed by the Davis amendment.

The first reaction to those figures is that they are excessive.

Well, in the first place let me say that the services do not intend to promote people to those ceilings at this time. It is possible at some future date with the same number of officers on active duty that the promotion system will require that number of officers on active duty serving in those grades. And I will say right now that insofar as requirements are concerned, the services should have those numbers of officers serving on active duty in each of those grades. But they are controlled by dollars, as is everything else, and they realize that they cannot always have on active duty in the various grades the number of officers necessary in each of these grades. But the ceilings proposed in this legislation would permit them to have these numbers of officers serving in each of these grades over and above that now contained in the limitations of the Defense Appropriation Act of 1954 if it becomes necessary to go to those ceilings to avoid heavy attrition and the forcible separation of fully qualified reserve officers serving on continuous active duty.

The point I am trying to make is that these are ceilings; they are not authorizations. They are ceilings which will be reached only when the circumstances require the attainment of these ceilings. At other times, as indicated by the planned budgeted strength for 1955, they will not attain these ceilings. For example, the budgeted end strength for the Army on June 30, 1955, contemplates 450 general officers. The ceilings contained in the proposed bill would permit 505 general officers. The budgeted strength for colonels is 4,652 on

June 30, 1955. The ceiling authorized for this strength is 5,134. And so on.

If you will refer to the charts in the report, you will be able to see what the situation is for each of the services. Again I want to stress the point that these are ceilings, not floors; they are maximum ceilings to avoid the undesirable consequences that otherwise would result if the ceilings were too low. That is one of the reasons why we cannot legislate numerical limitations every year.

Now, even with these budgeted strength figures for June 30, 1955, it may be necessary for the services to exceed those figures, since they are not bound by an anticipated grade distribution on a budget estimate. In other words, they get a specific amount of money to pay for an estimated number of officers. But if they find that they have 10, 20, 30, or 100 more officers in a particular grade in excess of that which they are budgeted for, they merely reduce the input of officers temporarily to balance the dollars. In other words, the money control, which we do not dispute in any way, is flexible enough to permit long-range planning. Numerical limitations, upon which no one can base a promotion plan until the appropriation is actually in hand, only permits, at the most, 1 year planning, which even then is too late to permit the normal selection process to take place.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have talked far too long on this subject and I am sure there are many, many questions that will be asked, but I do want to say a few more things before I close.

This proposed legislation also repeals the limitation on voluntary retirement. If you will refer to the report, I think you will find ample justification for our action. We think the limitation on voluntary retirement has served its purpose and that we should now restore the privilege of applying for voluntary retirement—a privilege which has been enjoyed by officers for many years and which should not be taken from them except at a time when we are ordering reserve officers to active duty on an involuntary basis. If we are going to change the rules of the game let us do it for those who plan to enter the armed services in the future so they will know what the future holds, but let us keep faith with the officers who have already entered the armed services. When there is an abuse of a privilege, then that privilege must be restricted or eliminated, but I think the statistics in the report will prove that this privilege has not been abused. I could even justify voluntary retirement on a financial basis but that involves so many ifs and ands that I will not attempt to do so. I can only say that it is time that we eliminated this restriction on voluntary retirement in order that our officers may know that we will keep faith with them to the best of our ability.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot too strongly stress the importance of this proposed legislation with respect to that "hard core of professional soldiers" to which the President of the United States referred in his state of the Union message.

We have all witnessed a constant whitening away of benefits heretofore enjoyed by service personnel. We have seen commissaries threatened, the attempt made to cut down medical and dental care of dependents, severe restrictions placed on the shipment of household effects, restrictions imposed on voluntary retirement, and limitations placed upon officer promotions.

We are playing with dynamite—because we are endangering our security by attempting to economize at the expense of the people who keep us a free Nation.

I am not going to wave the flag and make a patriotic speech about our Armed Forces, but I am going to say this: The officers in our Armed Forces are the leaders of our hard core of professional soldiers; their decisions will spell the difference between victory or defeat if a third world war should be our fate. And what we have done to them in the past is reflected in the numbers of officers who are resigning—or even worse—are refusing regular commissions.

Just ask yourself this question: "Where will we get the Eisenhoweres, the Denfelds, the Spaatzes, the Kenneys, the Vandenberges, the Bradleys, the Radfords, the Vandergrifts, the Arnolds, the Kings, the Halseys, the Twinings, the Ridgways, the Shepherds, or the Carneys, 10 or 20 years from now if we continue to play havoc with the careers of young officers who want to be a part of that hard core of professional soldiers, but who just won't take this treatment we have been dishing out for the past few years?"

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the future of our Armed Forces; I am worried about the young men who will not make the service a career. And I hope you are all as much concerned about this matter as I am.

We can go a long way toward reversing this dangerous trend by enacting this proposed legislation.

Now in conclusion, I want to express my appreciation to the members of my committee who sat through 22 days of subcommittee hearings, under the patient chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDT] with the able help of our industrious counsel, Mr. Blandford, and 9 days of full committee hearings on this subject. We do not pretend to know all the answers, but we do think we have a reasonable, workable, sensible, practical bill. We think it will solve the problems that have bothered the Congress for some time insofar as a brake on temporary promotions is concerned. We do not think the services have abused temporary promotions but this bill if enacted into law will prevent any possible abuse that might conceivably have taken place in the future. It is a complicated subject and the bill itself is complicated, but I can assure you that all of us on the Committee on Armed Services have the interests of the Nation, as well as the armed services, at heart, and that what we propose here is for the best interests of both the taxpayers and the officers who we expect

to be ready to maintain our freedom at all times. We are deeply concerned about the morale of our Armed Forces and I regret to say that letters and personal interviews with many young men who might otherwise have made the armed services a career, have convinced us that these two restrictions, which are repealed in this bill, are among the main reasons given by these young men for not making the service a career. I am sure that the proposed legislation will go a long way toward removing these barriers.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee who spent many hours in the preparation and development of this legislation, I am most satisfied with House bill 7103. It should be passed overwhelmingly by the House.

Mr. Chairman, for some time the need for legislation such as the proposed Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954 has become more and more apparent. When the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 was enacted, it was visualized that in about 10 years, or about 1957, the Armed Forces would have been gradually reduced to a size approximating that of the Regular Establishment. However, the requirement for an armed force much larger than the Regular Establishment has continued. The recent Korean conflict, together with the persistently touchy international situation, has emphasized the fact that our Armed Forces must be maintained at a strength considerably larger than the Regular Establishment for the indefinite future. Consequently, the limitations of officers by grade as spelled out for the Regular components has been of use principally in maintaining the strength of the Regular Officer Corps by permanent grade within legal limits.

However, since the Armed Forces have been expanded well beyond the size of the Regular components for some time, temporary promotions have been necessary. In making the temporary promotions required following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea it appears to me that the services have done their best to assure that the best fitted and most experienced officers available have been promoted to fill the positions of increased responsibility engendered by our enlarged forces. I frankly do not believe that the services have abused their trust. Nevertheless, I believe it would be wise for the Congress to ascertain the approximate strengths of the Armed Forces for the next several years at least and to prescribe ceilings in the upper grades to insure that no excessive temporary promotions can be made regardless of everyone's best intentions. The proposed Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954 prescribes limitations on the number of officers who may be maintained on active duty in the grade of major or lieutenant commander, or higher. These limitations were determined after exhaustive study by the Committee on Armed Services and after extensive hearings during which departmental witnesses were questioned at length. Our questioning covered all phases of temporary

and permanent promotion of active-duty personnel, the assignments of colonels and generals throughout the entire world, and the necessity of providing a reasonably attractive career for our young men and women in the Armed Forces.

The urgency of providing a reasonably attractive career for our young men and women in the Armed Forces is a particularly knotty one at present. Ever since World War II the services have been forced to maintain large numbers of non-Regular officers on active duty on a more or less permanent basis. For example at the present time almost 80 percent of the officer corps of the Army is composed of non-Regular personnel. Although it is true that each year there are many thousands of ROTC students and doctors called into the Army, I would venture to say that perhaps more than 50,000 of these non-Regulars might be termed career officers. Many of these officers have now served on active duty more or less continuously since World War II. Thus we have large numbers of non-Regular officers who have between 5 and 15 years of active duty military service. Some have even more. Consequently, this group of non-Regular officers are professional soldiers. The loss of appreciable numbers of them from the Active Establishment would be a heavy blow to the Army.

It is quite obvious that in any promotion program the greatest number of promotions will go to the lower grades since there are more of them. Since the long-term reservists generally have less than 12 or 15 years' service, they are found in the lower field grades and in the company grades. The expansion following Korea permitted the promotion of many thousands of these long-term reservists. However, the future of these officers who now have a substantial retirement equity by virtue of their long service is not as secure as if they were Regular officers. Their continued service on active duty can never be assured. Yet these officers have contributed greatly to the defense of their country during two wars. This service cannot be ignored.

Obviously, the Congress should not attempt to prescribe that a large Army will be maintained, irrespective of need, simply to provide employment. However, it will be necessary to retain large numbers of non-Regular officers on active duty and a reasonable opportunity for advancement and a decent active duty career should be provided.

The Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954 imposes realistic limitations on the number of field grade and general officers while at the same time providing reasonable opportunity for promotion. It meets our needs and specifications as far as can be foreseen at present.

Many of us have become increasingly concerned of late with the slow deterioration of the attractiveness of a career in our Armed Forces for our outstanding young men and women. We have been most fortunate in the past that we have had in our services officers of great devotion and of great skill. However,

in recent years, so much has been taken away from the serviceman that young men just aren't entering our Armed Forces on a career basis. Fringe benefits in lieu of pay have been withheld, voluntary retirements permitted by law have been stopped by short-term appropriation act amendments. Promotions in 1953 were also curtailed by similar amendments. Should this trend continue we will most certainly breed mediocrity in the leadership of our Armed Services. Mediocrity of leadership can lead to only one result—military disaster in the event of war.

Mr. Chairman, the attractiveness of the services must be restored and the high caliber of our future leadership assured. The proposed Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954 is a step in the right direction. It visualizes a realistic officer grade distribution and yet permits a reasonable flow of promotions, at least for the immediate future.

It will do much to eliminate some of the objections young men have raised when confronted with the choice of making the service a career. I think it will stop this trend toward mediocrity which threatens to make our Armed Forces second best. No one ever won a war with a second best army.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of this measure. I think it is timely. I think the committee has done an excellent job.

I rise at this time primarily to pay tribute to one of the great soldiers of World War II who lies desperately ill in Walter Reed Hospital. I have reference to General Hoyt Vandenberg who is desperately ill at the present time. I pray that God may give him strength to fight the serious disease which is attacking him at this time.

Our Nation has gained much by his advice and counsel on military air power. He dedicated himself to this arm of our defense and so ably preserved both the spirit and the very life blood of our liberties. Fortunately for America we have such men as Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time now because I could not earlier, when I spoke at length, make this statement. I want it incorporated as a part of the RECORD.

I want to thank the fine and efficient members of my subcommittee, and the members of the full Armed Services Committee, our most able counsel, Mr. Blandford, for the diligent and patient efforts put forth in bringing this bill to the floor of the House for passage. It is a fine legislative proposal and as time goes on will prove to be extremely beneficial to our Armed Forces. That is its purpose.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954."*

#### TITLE I—ARMY

SEC. 101. On the last day of each fiscal year the percentages determined by the number of commissioned officers on active duty in the Army in each of the following grades when compared to the total number of commissioned officers on active duty in the Army authorized by the Secretary of the Army (exclusive of Reserve officers on active duty for training purposes only, and officers serving with other departments or agencies of the Government on a reimbursable basis) shall not exceed the percentages which are set forth in the following table:

Officer strength	General	Colonel	Lieutenant colonel	Major
50,000.....	350	3,352	6,940	9,350
Percent.....	.70	6.70	13.88	18.70
60,000.....	400	3,752	8,045	10,850
Percent.....	.67	6.25	13.41	18.08
70,000.....	425	4,102	9,150	12,350
Percent.....	.61	5.86	13.07	17.64
80,000.....	450	4,452	10,205	13,675
Percent.....	.56	5.56	12.76	17.09
90,000.....	475	4,752	11,260	15,000
Percent.....	.53	5.28	12.51	16.67
100,000.....	495	5,002	12,265	16,310
Percent.....	.50	5.00	12.27	16.31
110,000.....	510	5,202	13,270	17,620
Percent.....	.46	4.73	12.06	16.02
120,000.....	520	5,402	14,175	18,930
Percent.....	.43	4.50	11.81	15.77
130,000.....	530	5,602	15,075	20,190
Percent.....	.41	4.31	11.60	15.33
140,000.....	540	5,802	15,875	21,395
Percent.....	.39	4.14	11.34	15.28
150,000.....	550	6,002	16,675	22,600
Percent.....	.37	4.00	11.12	15.07

In the event such authorized strength of commissioned officers on active duty falls between 2 strengths shown in the above table the percentages will be determined by mathematical interpolation between the percentages prescribed for the 2 strengths. The numbers authorized for any grade prescribed in the above table may be exceeded by the cumulative number of vacancies in any higher grades.

SEC. 102. If, during any period of mobilization or demobilization occurring on or after July 1, 1954, the commissioned officer strength authorized by the Secretary of the Army varies by 6 percent or more within any 12-month period, there shall be allowed a period of 12 months from the end of that period of mobilization or demobilization to conform to the figures prescribed by the table set forth in section 101 of this title.

SEC. 103. When the authorized strength of the Army in commissioned officers on active duty exceeds 150,000, the Secretary of the Army shall, in general conformity with the table set forth in section 102 of this title, fix the authorized strength in each of the grades covered by that table.

#### TITLE II—COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

SEC. 201. Subsection 303 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. (a) Of the total number of line officers serving on active duty at any one time, exclusive of officers carried by law as additional numbers in grade and of fleet admirals, the number of officers who may serve in each of the grades above lieutenant shall be no greater than a number appropriate to the total number as set forth in the following table: *Provided*, That of the number of officers so determined in each grade below captain, not to exceed the following percentages may be officers designated for limited duty: In the grade of commander, 3.64 percent; in the grade of lieutenant commander, 8.62 percent."

## Unrestricted line

Total line officers, <sup>1</sup> exclusive of officers, carried by law as extra numbers and of fleet admirals	Rear admiral and above		Captain		Commander		Lieutenant commander	
	Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>
32,000.....	215	0.67	1,920	6.00	3,840	12.00	5,760	18.00
40,000.....	222	.56	2,320	5.80	4,498	11.25	7,080	17.70
50,000.....	228	.46	2,758	5.52	5,235	10.47	8,650	17.30
60,000.....	237	.40	3,140	5.23	5,851	9.75	10,148	16.91
70,000.....	244	.35	3,479	4.97	6,374	9.11	11,487	16.41
80,000.....	252	.32	3,782	4.73	6,821	8.53	12,752	15.94
90,000.....	259	.29	4,053	4.50	7,205	8.01	13,914	15.46
100,000.....	262	.26	4,295	4.30	7,538	7.54	15,030	15.03
125,000.....	291	.23	4,792	3.83	8,201	6.56	17,500	13.00
150,000.....	305	.20	5,165	3.44	8,683	5.79	19,500	14.00
175,000.....	323	.18	5,441	3.11	9,617	5.15	21,175	12.10
200,000.....	342	.17	5,640	2.82	9,244	4.62	22,560	11.28
250,000.....	379	.15	5,854	2.34	9,504	3.80	24,600	9.84

<sup>1</sup> Where the total number of line officers on active duty, exclusive of officers carried by law as extra numbers and of fleet admirals, exceeds a number specified in this column, but is less than the next larger number specified, the number of officers in each of the grades here tabulated may exceed the tabulation number by a number which is a fraction of the next increment in grade tabulation equal to the proportion of the excess in total number to the next tabulation of total number.

<sup>2</sup> Number shall govern; percent is for information only.

SEC. 202. Subsection 303 (f) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 is amended by deleting all after the words "in each corps" and substituting therefor the words "a number no greater than a number appropriate to the number of officers in that corps serving on active duty, as set forth in the following tables:

Total number of officers in the corps on active duty	Number of rear admirals	Information only
Supply Corps:		
2,600.....	13	0.50
3,000.....	15	.50
4,000.....	18	.45
5,000.....	19	.38
7,000.....	20	.29
9,000.....	21	.23
11,000.....	22	.20
13,000.....	23	.18
15,000.....	24	.17
17,000.....	25	.15
Medical Corps:		
3,000.....	15	.50
4,000.....	18	.45
5,000.....	19	.38
7,000.....	20	.29
9,000.....	21	.23
11,000.....	22	.20
13,000.....	23	.18
15,000.....	24	.17
Civil Engineer Corps:		
1,000.....	5	.50
1,500.....	6	.40
2,000.....	7	.35
3,000.....	8	.27
4,000.....	9	.23
5,000.....	10	.20
7,000.....	11	.17
Dental Corps:		
1,000.....	5	.50
2,000.....	6	.30
4,000.....	7	.18
7,000.....	8	.14
Chaplain Corps:		
500.....	2	.40
1,600.....	3	.19
2,800.....	3	.11

Provided further, That when the total number of officers on active duty in any corps exceeds a tabulated number of officers on active duty in that corps but is less than the next tabulated number the authorized number of rear admirals may be increased by a number which is a fraction of the next tabulated increment of authorized numbers equal to the proportion such excess is to the tabulated increment of total number on active duty: *Provided further*, That when the number of officers on active duty in a corps is less than the least tabulated number in the appropriate table the authorized number of rear admirals shall be 5 percent of the total number of officers on active duty in that corps: *Provided further*, That such a rear admiral serving as a chief of bureau shall upon termination of his tenure as chief of bureau be carried in excess till the next vacancy occurs in the grade of rear admiral in the corps concerned: *And provided further*, That

the number of captains in the Medical Service Corps and the number of commanders and lieutenant commanders in the Nurse Corps shall not exceed 2 percent, 1 percent, and 2.5 percent, respectively, of the total number of officers in the corps concerned serving on active duty at any one time."

SEC. 203. That portion of subsection 303 (g) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, occurring before the second proviso is further amended to read as follows:

"(g) To determine the authorized number of line officers in each of the various grades above lieutenant, as provided in this section, computations shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of approval of this act and thereafter at such times that the needs of the service require but not less than once annually, and the resulting number in each of such various grades, as so computed, shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, be held and considered for all purposes as the authorized number of officers in each of such various grades and shall not be varied between such computations: *Provided*, That to determine the authorized number of line officers designated for limited duty in each of the various grades above lieutenant, the Secretary of the Navy, as of the date of approval of this act and thereafter at such times that the needs of the service require but not less than once annually, shall compute the maximum number of such officers which may serve in each of such various grades, as provided in subsection (a) of this section, and shall determine the number of such officers in each of such various grades, not to exceed such maximum number, required to meet the needs of the service during the ensuing year, and the resulting number in each of such various grades, as so determined, shall be held and considered for all purposes as the

authorized number of such officers in each of such various grades, and shall not be varied between such determinations."

SEC. 204. Subsection 303 (k) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"(k) Upon determination of the authorized number of officers in each of the various grades above lieutenant, with respect to officers serving on active duty as provided in this section, and with respect to officers holding permanent appointments on the active list of the Regular Navy, as provided in section 103 of title I and section 203 of title II of this act, computations shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy to determine the authorized number of officers which may serve under temporary appointment in the line in each of the various grades above lieutenant and in each grade in a staff corps where computations are prescribed to determine the authorized number. At the same time, the Secretary of the Navy shall determine within the combined grades of lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade), and ensign, the number of officers serving under temporary appointments required in each of those grades to meet the needs of the service. Should the Secretary of the Navy determine, at the time of making the computations prescribed by subsections (g) and (h) of this section, that in any grade above lieutenant a lesser number of officers than the computed number of officers for that grade is required to meet the needs of the service, the lesser number shall be held and considered to be the authorized number for that grade and the reduction may be applied as an increase in the authorized number of such officers in any lower grade or grades."

SEC. 205. Subsection 314 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 314 (a) Commissioned officers of the Marine Corps shall be authorized in number in the same proportion to authorized enlisted strength and shall be distributed in grades, promoted, retired, and discharged in like manner and with the same relative conditions in all respects as provided for commissioned officers of the line of the Navy, by existing law, or by laws hereafter enacted, except as may be necessary to adapt the said provisions to the Marine Corps, or as herein otherwise provided. Of the total number of officers not restricted in the performance of duty serving on active duty at any one time, exclusive of officers carried by law as additional numbers in grade, the number of officers who may serve in each of the grades above captain shall be no greater than a number appropriate to the total number as set forth in the following table: *Provided*, That of the number of officers so determined in each grade below colonel, not to exceed the following percentages may be officers designated for limited duty: In the grade of lieutenant colonel, 3.64 percent; in the grade of major, 8.62 percent."

## Unrestricted line

Total line officers <sup>1</sup> exclusive of officers carried by law as extra numbers	Brigadier general and above		Colonel		Lieutenant colonel		Major	
	Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>
10,000.....	51	0.51	600	6.00	1,200	12.00	1,800	18.00
12,500.....	52	.42	615	4.92	1,250	10.00	2,175	17.40
15,000.....	53	.35	630	4.20	1,295	8.63	2,535	16.90
17,500.....	54	.31	645	3.69	1,335	7.63	2,880	16.46
20,000.....	55	.28	660	3.30	1,370	6.85	3,210	16.05
22,500.....	57	.25	670	2.98	1,400	6.22	3,525	15.67
25,000.....	59	.24	680	2.72	1,425	5.70	3,825	15.30
27,500.....	61	.22	690	2.51	1,445	5.25	4,110	14.95
30,000.....	63	.21	700	2.33	1,460	4.87	4,380	14.60
32,500.....	65	.20	705	2.17	1,470	4.52	4,635	14.26
35,000.....	67	.19	710	2.03	1,475	4.21	4,875	13.93

<sup>1</sup> Where the total number of officers unrestricted in the performance of duty, exclusive of officers carried by law as extra numbers exceeds a number specified in this column, but is less than the next larger number specified, the number of officers in each of the grades here tabulated may exceed the tabulation number by a number which is a fraction of the next increment in grade tabulation equal to the proportion of the excess in total number to the next tabulation of total number.

<sup>2</sup> Number shall govern; percent is for information only.

### TITLE III. COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE AIR FORCE

SEC. 301. The strength of the Air Force in commissioned officers on active duty in each of the following grades on the last day of

each fiscal year shall not exceed the percentage, set forth in the following table, of the total number of commissioned officers of the Air Force determined by the Secretary of the Air Force to be on active duty.

1. Total commissioned officers, inclusive	2. General and colonel combined	3. Lieutenant colonel	4. Major
50,000 to 59,999	6.89	6.44 (312 324)	12.13 11.37 18.91 18.83
60,000 to 69,999	6.44	5.99 (324 336)	11.37 10.61 18.83 18.75
70,000 to 79,999	5.99	5.57 (336 349)	10.61 9.90 18.75 18.67
80,000 to 89,999	5.57	5.18 (349 363)	9.90 9.24 18.67 18.60
90,000 to 99,999	5.18	4.82 (363 380)	9.24 8.62 18.60 18.53
100,000 to 109,999	4.82	4.68 (380 398)	8.62 8.50 18.53 18.45
110,000 to 119,999	4.68	4.53 (398 416)	8.50 8.38 18.45 18.38
120,000 to 129,999	4.53	4.39 (416 434)	8.38 8.25 18.38 18.31
130,000 to 139,999	4.39	4.24 (434 452)	8.25 8.12 18.31 18.24
140,000 to 149,999	4.24	4.09 (452 470)	8.12 8.00 18.24 18.17
150,000 to 159,999	4.09	3.95 (470 478)	8.00 7.88 18.17 18.11
160,000 to 169,999	3.95	3.80 (478 486)	7.88 7.75 18.11 18.05
170,000 to 180,000	3.80	3.65 (486 495)	7.75 7.62 18.05 17.96

SEC. 302. The percentages in columns 2, 3, and 4 of the table set forth in section 301 of this title shall be applied on a prorated basis based on the strength within the brackets set forth in column 1.

SEC. 303. General officers included in the percentage figure in column 2 of the table set forth in section 301 of this title are limited to the figures set forth in the respective parentheses and shall be based on the strength within the brackets set forth in column 1. Not more than 50 percent of the general officer strength may be in a grade above brigadier general.

SEC. 304. The strength authorized for any grade under the table set forth in section 301 of this title may be exceeded by the number of officers in that grade who are on active duty for training purposes only plus the number assigned to an agency or department, other than the Department of the Air Force, on a reimbursable basis.

SEC. 305. If, during any period of mobilization or demobilization occurring on or after July 1, 1954, the actual commissioned officer strength varies by 6 percent or more within any 12-month period, there shall be allowed a period of 12 months from the end of that period of mobilization or demobilization to conform to the figures prescribed by the table set forth in section 301 of this title.

SEC. 306. The strength authorized for any grade under section 301, 302, or 303 of this title which is not utilized for that grade may be utilized for any lower grade.

SEC. 307. Whenever circumstances require that the actual strength of the Air Force in commissioned officers on active duty be more than 180,000, the Secretary of the Air Force shall, in general conformity with the table set forth in section 301 of this title, fix the authorized strength of each of the grades covered by that table.

### TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Subsection 631 (a), and that portion of subsection 631 (b) occurring before the proviso of the act of August 1, 1953 (67 Stat. 355), are repealed.

SEC. 402. That portion of title II of the act of August 1, 1953, appearing under the heading "Retired Pay" (67 Stat. 337), is amended by deleting all after the word "necessary" and substituting therefor a period.

SEC. 403. The President may suspend all or any part of the provisions of this act in time of war, or in time of national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress or by the President.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That this act

may be cited as the 'Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954.'

### "TITLE I—ARMY

"SEC. 101. The number of commissioned officers on active duty in the Army in each of the following grades on the last day of each fiscal year when compared to the total number of commissioned officers on active duty in the Army authorized by the Secretary of the Army (exclusive of Reserve officers on active duty for training purposes only, and officers serving with other departments or agencies of the Government on a reimbursable basis) shall not exceed the numbers which are set forth in the following table:

"Officer strength	General	Colonel	Lieutenant colonel	Major
50,000	350	3,352	6,940	9,350
60,000	400	3,752	8,045	10,950
70,000	425	4,102	9,150	12,500
80,000	450	4,452	10,205	14,050
90,000	475	4,752	11,260	15,600
100,000	495	5,002	12,265	17,060
110,000	510	5,202	13,270	18,370
120,000	520	5,402	14,175	19,680
130,000	530	5,602	15,075	20,890
140,000	540	5,802	15,875	22,095
150,000	550	6,002	16,675	23,300

In the event such authorized strength of commissioned officers on active duty falls between 2 strengths shown in the above table the numbers will be determined by mathematical interpolation between the numbers prescribed for the 2 strengths. The numbers authorized for any grade prescribed in the above table may be exceeded by the cumulative number of vacancies in any higher grades. Not more than 50 percent of the general-officer strength may be in a grade above brigadier general.

"SEC. 102. When the authorized strength of the Army in commissioned officers on active duty exceeds 150,000, the Secretary of the Army shall, in general conformity with the table set forth in section 101 of this title, fix the authorized strength in each of the grades covered by that table.

### "TITLE II—COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

"SEC. 201. Subsection 303 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. (a) Of the total number of line officers serving on active duty at any one time, exclusive of officers carried by law as additional numbers in grade and of fleet admirals, the number of officers who may serve in each of the grades above lieutenant shall, except as otherwise provided by subsection 303 (k) of this act, be no greater

than a number appropriate to the total number as set forth in the following table:

### "Unrestricted line

"Total line officers, exclusive of officers carried by law as extra numbers and of fleet admirals	Rear admiral and above	Captain	Commander	Lieutenant commander
32,000	215	1,920	3,840	5,760
40,000	222	2,320	4,498	7,080
50,000	228	2,758	5,235	8,650
60,000	237	3,140	5,851	10,148
70,000	244	3,479	6,374	11,487
80,000	252	3,782	6,821	12,752
90,000	259	4,053	7,205	13,914
100,000	262	4,295	7,538	15,030
120,000	291	4,792	8,201	17,500
150,000	305	5,165	8,683	19,500
175,000	323	5,441	9,017	21,175
200,000	342	5,640	9,244	22,560
250,000	379	5,854	9,504	24,600

In the event the total number of such line officers serving on active duty falls between two strengths shown in the above table the number in each grade shall be determined by proportionate interpolation between the respective numbers prescribed for the two strengths. Of the number of officers determined under this section for each grade below captain not to exceed the following percentages may be officers designated for limited duty: In the grade of commander, 3.64 percent; in the grade of lieutenant commander 8.62 percent.

"SEC. 202. Subsection 303 (f) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 is amended by deleting all after the words 'in each corps' and substituting therefor the words 'a number no greater than a number appropriate to the number of officers in that corps serving on active duty, as set forth in the following table:

"Total number of officers in the corps on active duty	Number of rear admirals
Supply Corps:	
2,600	13
3,000	15
4,000	18
5,000	19
7,000	20
9,000	21
11,000	22
13,000	23
15,000	24
17,000	25
Medical Corps:	
3,000	15
4,000	18
5,000	19
7,000	20
9,000	21
11,000	22
13,000	23
15,000	24
Civil Engineer Corps:	
1,000	5
1,500	6
2,000	7
3,000	8
4,000	9
5,000	10
7,000	11
Dental Corps:	
1,000	5
2,000	6
4,000	7
7,000	8
Chaplain Corps:	
500	2
1,000	3
2,800	3

When the total number of officers on active duty in any corps falls between two strengths shown in the appropriate table above the number of rear admirals shall be determined by appropriate interpolation between the numbers prescribed for the two strengths. When the number of officers on active duty in a corps is less than the least tabulated number in the appropriate table the authorized number of rear admirals shall be five-

tenths of 1 percent of the total number of officers on active duty in that corps: *Provided further*, That such a rear admiral serving as a chief of bureau shall upon termination of his tenure as chief of bureau be carried in excess until the next vacancy occurs in the grade of rear admiral in the corps concerned: *And provided further*, That the number of captains in the Medical Service Corps and the number of commanders and lieutenant commanders in the Nurse Corps shall not exceed 2 percent, 1.75 percent, and 7.75 percent, respectively, of the total number of officers in the corps concerned serving on active duty at any one time.

"Sec. 203. That portion of subsection 303 (g) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, occurring before the second proviso is further amended to read as follows:

"(g) To determine the authorized number of line officers in each of the various grades above lieutenant, as provided in this section, computations shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of approval of this act and thereafter at such times that the needs of the service require but not less than once annually, and the resulting number in each of such various grades, as so computed, shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, be held and considered for all purposes as the authorized number of officers in each of such various grades and shall not be varied between such computations: *Provided*, That to determine the authorized number of line officers designated for limited duty in each of the various grades above lieutenant, the Secretary of the Navy, as of the date of approval of this act and thereafter at such times that the needs of the service require but not less than once annually, shall compute the maximum number of such officers which may serve in each of such various grades, as provided in subsection (a) of this section, and shall determine the number of such officers in each of such various grades, not to exceed such maximum number, required to meet the needs of the service during the ensuing year, and the resulting number in each of such various grades, as so determined, shall be held and considered for all purposes as the authorized number of such officers in each of such various grades, and shall not be varied between such determinations."

"Sec. 204. Subsection 303 (k) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"(k) Upon determination of the authorized number of officers in each of the various grades above lieutenant, with respect to officers serving on active duty as provided in this section, and with respect to officers holding permanent appointments on the active list of the Regular Navy, as provided in section 103 of title I and section 203 of title II of this act, computations shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy to determine the authorized number of officers which may serve under temporary appointment in the line in each of the various grades above lieutenant and in each grade in a staff corps where computations are prescribed to determine the authorized number. At the same time, the Secretary of the Navy shall determine within the combined grades of lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade), and ensign, the number of officers serving under temporary appointments required in each of those grades to meet the needs of the service. Should the Secretary of the Navy determine, at the time of making the computations prescribed by subsections (g) and (h) of this section, that in any grade above lieutenant a lesser number of officers than the computed number of officers for that grade is required to meet the needs of the service, the lesser number shall be held and considered to be the authorized number for that grade and the reduction may be applied as an increase in the authorized number of such officers in any lower grade or grades.

"Sec. 205. Subsection 314 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 314. (a) Commissioned officers of the Marine Corps shall be authorized in number in the same proportion to authorized enlisted strength and shall be distributed in grades, promoted, retired, and discharged in like manner and with the same relative conditions in all respects as provided for commissioned officers of the line of the Navy, by existing law, or by laws hereafter enacted, except as may be necessary to adapt the said provisions to the Marine Corps, or as herein otherwise provided. Of the total number of officers not restricted in the performance of duty serving on active duty at any one time, exclusive of officers carried by law as additional numbers in grade, the number of officers who may serve in each of the grades above captain shall, except as otherwise provided by subsection 303 (k) of this act, be no greater than a number appropriate to the total number as set forth in the following table:

"Unrestricted line

Total line officers, exclusive of officers carried by law as extra numbers	Brigadier general and above	Colonel	Lieutenant colonel	Major
10,000.....	51	600	1,200	1,800
12,500.....	52	615	1,250	2,175
15,000.....	53	630	1,295	2,535
17,500.....	54	645	1,335	2,880
20,000.....	55	660	1,370	3,210
22,500.....	57	670	1,400	3,525
25,000.....	59	680	1,425	3,825
27,500.....	61	690	1,445	4,110
30,000.....	63	700	1,460	4,380
32,500.....	65	705	1,470	4,635
35,000.....	67	710	1,475	4,875

In the event the total number of such line officers serving on active duty falls between two strengths shown in the above table the number in each grade shall be determined by proportionate interpolation between the respective numbers prescribed for the two strengths. Of the number of officers determined under this section for each grade below colonel not to exceed the following percentages may be officers designated for limited duty: In the grade of lieutenant colonel, 3.64 percent; in the grade of major, 8.62 percent."

"TITLE III—COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE AIR FORCE

"Sec. 301. The number of commissioned officers of the Air Force on active duty in each of the following grades on the last day of each fiscal year shall not exceed the numbers, set forth in columns 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the following table, applicable to the total number of commissioned officers of the Air Force determined by the Secretary of the Air Force to be on active duty.

"1. Total commissioned officers on active duty	2. General officers	3. Colonel	4. Lieutenant colonel	5. Major
50,000.....	312	3,133	6,065	9,455
60,000.....	324	3,540	6,822	11,298
70,000.....	336	3,857	7,427	13,125
80,000.....	349	4,107	7,920	14,936
90,000.....	363	4,299	8,316	16,740
100,000.....	380	4,440	8,620	18,530
110,000.....	398	4,750	9,350	20,295
120,000.....	416	5,020	10,056	22,036
130,000.....	434	5,273	10,725	23,803
140,000.....	452	5,484	11,368	25,536
150,000.....	470	5,665	12,000	27,255
160,000.....	478	5,842	12,608	28,976
170,000.....	486	5,974	13,175	30,685
180,000.....	495	6,075	13,716	32,328

"Sec. 302. If the number of commissioned officers on active duty falls between 2 strength figures set forth in column 1 of the table set forth in section 301 of this

title, the numbers in columns 2, 3, 4, and 5 of that table shall be determined by mathematical interpolation between the numbers prescribed for the 2 strengths.

"Sec. 303. Not more than 50 percent of the general officer strength may be in a grade above brigadier general.

"Sec. 304. The strength authorized for any grade under the table set forth in section 301 of this title may be exceeded by the number of officers in that grade who are on active duty for training purposes only plus the number assigned to an agency or department, other than the Department of the Air Force, on a reimbursable basis.

"Sec. 305. The strength authorized for any grade under section 301, 302, or 303 of this title which is not utilized for that grade may be utilized for any lower grade.

"Sec. 306. Whenever circumstances require that the actual strength of the Air Force in commissioned officers on active duty be more than 180,000, the Secretary of the Air Force shall, in general conformity with the table set forth in section 301 of this title, fix the authorized strength of each of the grades covered by that table.

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Sec. 401. Subsection 631 (a), and that portion of subsection 631 (b) occurring before the proviso of the act of August 1, 1953 (67 Stat. 355), are repealed.

"Sec. 402. That portion of title II of the act of August 1, 1953, appearing under the heading 'Retired Pay' (67 Stat. 337), is amended by deleting all after the word 'necessary' and substituting therefor a period.

"Sec. 403. The President may suspend all or any part of the provisions of this act in time of war, or in time of national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress or by the President. Notwithstanding section 426 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, the President may suspend all or any part of those provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which are amended by this act, which relate to grades above that of lieutenant, only in time of war, or in time of national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress or by the President.

"Sec. 404. Not later than January 30 of each year, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall present to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the estimated active-duty personnel requirements for his respective service for the next fiscal year, the estimated number of commissioned officers in each grade on active duty whether by permanent or temporary appointment, to be promoted during the next fiscal year, and an analysis of the current distribution by grade of commissioned officers serving on active duty, whether by permanent or temporary appointment."

Mr. ARENDS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we who have worked for many years both in and out of Congress for the improvement of the nursing profession are especially happy to see that action is being taken to increase the numbers of Navy Nurse Corps officers who may serve in the higher grades.

H. R. 7103, the bill under consideration, will increase the proportion of authorized commanders from seven-tenths of 1 percent to 1.75 percent, and the proportion of lieutenant commanders from 1.6 percent to 7.75 percent. Numerically this means an increase from 16 to 44 commanders and from 46 to 191 lieutenant commanders.

Under the present restrictions only a token number of Navy nurses may be promoted above the rank of lieutenant. This bleak prospect for career recognition, combined with the nationwide shortage of nurses, has seriously jeopardized the Navy's capabilities for the care of their sick.

On page 3304 of the hearings Admiral Pugh states that the Navy has lost over 500 nurses. It now has 2,438 nurses, of whom about half are in the Active Reserves. The Air Force has gained about 300 nurses. It now has a total of practically 2,700. The Army has a total of 4,419, 1,354 being Regulars and 3,065 being Active Reserves.

The enactment of this legislation will help bring the Navy Nurse Corps up to a par with the Army and Air Force, thereby helping to stimulate recruitment for the Navy.

Not only will the enactment of this legislation help the Navy in their recruitment efforts, but it should also help in the overall drive to recruit additional young women for nursing training. The committee is to be congratulated for taking this constructive action.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, may I mention that the enactment of my bill to commission male nurses as Reserve officers, H. R. 7898, will contribute very considerably in helping to solve this recruitment problem. I have just been informed that the Defense Department has assigned responsibility for a favorable report to the Army and that it is to be processed with all possible speed. I hope that bill will be coming before us very shortly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, no doubt this bill will pass. It is a well-considered bill.

As I listened to our very eloquent colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], sitting over here to his left as I was, I heard him express much fear about what would happen to our country after certain officers that he named—and they are entitled to all praise—died. And then he expressed great fear that they could not be replaced.

Well, I cannot go along with the fear that just because the present generation will die, that when that happens that that will be the end of the United States of America. No doubt long, long ago some people were speculating what was going to happen when Washington and those officers and men who for 8 long years served with him would pass away, and so on down to the War Between the

States when they thought of Grant and Sheridan and Sherman, and all who served with and under them. No doubt many thought they were indispensable. They, too, are dead, but the country and the Republic is still here, though perhaps not as strong in some ways as it was then.

Oh, no, I have no fear that when the men—admirals and generals and perhaps some of lower rank—mentioned by my colleague have ended their service here, that there will be no one to replace them. Young men of ability, young men of courage, have in recent years come from our Academies—some have enlisted into either one or the other branches of the armed services. Some, of course, like 1st Lt. Thomas Angelo Lombardo, and 2d Lt. John C. Trent, both of whom distinguished themselves on the football field and who met death in Korea, and many others, never will have the opportunity that it was the privilege of the men named by our colleague to have.

But fear not, as long as we adhere to the principles laid down in the Constitution, to the way of life our forefathers have given us, as long as we retain our independence, there will be an ever-succeeding generation able and ready and willing to serve the Republic, be it on the battlefield or on the homefront.

And, as our colleague was talking, I could not help but speculate as to whether he thought the same dismal end might be the fate of the Republic when the older Members of this or the other body passed away.

Then, as I looked to my right and saw sitting next to me our young colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], who served in the Armed Forces and for 7 years in the California Legislature, and beside him noted our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], and a little farther, across the aisle, our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], now approximately 36 years of age, who served 10 years in the Navy, who had 3 brothers in the Navy, 1 sister, and a brother-in-law with the armed services, and whose father, as so many of us know, served here so long and so faithfully, it occurred to me that we might better fear and worry about the quality of the service we were rendering, rather than about the ability and the patriotism of those who would succeed us.

Long have I thought that, instead of attempts to discourage or suppress the activities of our younger members, it might be well to give them a helping hand.

Age and experience are helpful in any field of endeavor, and that is especially true in the legislative halls of State and Nation, but, as from day to day I look around the Chamber, and I note the presence of men like BENTLEY and FORD, of Michigan, the former now at death's door from gunshot wounds received while serving here, as I see BYRD, from West Virginia; BROOKS, from Texas; STRINGFELLOW, from Utah; WAINWRIGHT, from New York; BYRNES, DAVIS, and SMITH of Wisconsin; MAILLIARD, GUBSER, HOLT, and WILSON of California; WAR-

BURTON, of Delaware; MERRILL, of Indiana; HYDE, of Maryland; BOLTON of Ohio, and many, many others—ready, able, willing, and anxious to assume their share of the legislative burden—I fear not at all for the future of the Republic.

Permit me to suggest to my colleagues who, though not as old as I, but who, nevertheless, are approaching what might be called old age, do not worry about the future. Do not worry about the future of the Republic. Let us direct our attention and our efforts to our everyday tasks. Let us jealously guard the sound principles so discriminatingly enumerated in the Constitution. Let us watch for the corruption from within as well as from the dangers which come from abroad.

On my right I notice my friend and colleague from Georgia, CARL VINSON, who for many, many years has served well and faithfully the interests of his people and of the country, and as I look into his face let me suggest to him and to others who are here, and who have served with distinction in this body, we need not worry, CARL, we need not worry—not only will others be here, but it is just possible that they may do a better job, render better service, than either you or I. That is my hope, and if I can look back from the Great Beyond, I haven't the slightest doubt but that I shall see the United States of America still the land to which every liberty-loving individual in this world will desire to come.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to ask a couple of questions of the chairman of the committee. Under the provisions of this bill, is any additional spending required? Any additional appropriation?

Mr. SHORT. No funds are involved.

Mr. GROSS. No additional funds are involved at all?

Mr. SHORT. No.

Mr. GROSS. And I assume some of the slack is taken up by virtue of the fact that the bill provides for a reduction of some 2,200 second lieutenants in the Army, is that correct?

Mr. SHORT. No, no, it establishes statutory limitations that did not exist under the Officer Personnel Act.

Mr. GROSS. It does not provide for a reduction of 2,200 second lieutenants in the Army?

Mr. SHORT. No, it has nothing to do with second lieutenants.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] spoke of some 6,000 officers of various rank being on duty in various parts of the world.

Mr. SHORT. That is because of the many military commissions that we have abroad with the NATO organization, the Supreme Allied Headquarters in Europe, and, in fact, all over the world. The Department of Defense has been called upon by the Department of State and other Government agencies to furnish generals and admirals to sit on commissions as a result of treaties and commitments that we have made with other nations. We hope that the number of those agencies will be reduced. Let me

say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that I am just as eager as he is to see many of these agencies liquidated as soon as possible.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correct in assuming that not a single dime will be spent for the pay or maintenance of these 6,000 officers out of the so-called mutual security funds?

Mr. SHORT. No.

Mr. GROSS. So this is just another instance of the spending that may be added to foreign aid of one kind or another, is that correct?

Mr. SHORT. Some of these funds may be reimbursable. May I say to my friend that that is getting into sort of classified information.

Mr. GROSS. I seem to have a habit of running into that.

Mr. SHORT. We run into it ourselves.

Mr. GROSS. The United Nations is not classified, is it?

Mr. SHORT. No.

Mr. GROSS. We have 22 naval officers up there including an admiral, a captain, and I believe 6 commanders.

Mr. SHORT. They are paid by the Navy?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, they are paid by the Navy, but they are serving at that "tower of bable" known as the United Nations, are they not? What possible excuse can there be for 26 naval officers being stationed at the United Nations?

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman would have to discuss that with the former Senator, our American delegate to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that that is not classified information. I think I know how the gentleman from Missouri feels about some of this foreign spending and some other things we are doing as a matter of foreign policy.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BATES. This bill does not authorize any certain number of officers. It merely imposes a ceiling and the point that the gentleman brings up might be properly considered when the appropriation bill comes to the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7103) to establish limitations on the numbers of officers who may serve in various commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 462, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was granted permission to address the House for 40 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H. R. 7103.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 464) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 461, making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE]; and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 464 makes in order consideration, under 1 hour general debate, House Joint Resolution 461, which comes from the Committee on Appropriations, and provides an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, to meet the salaries and expenses which will be incurred in the Mexican Farm Labor program, legislation which we approved last week.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. LYLE. I reserve my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 461) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the House Joint Resolution 461, with Mr. JENKINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution has been necessary because of the situation concerning our agreement with Mexico on the importation of farm labor.

In the regular 1954 appropriation for this program, \$1,150,000 was granted for its operation up to and including December 31, 1953, with an additional allowance of \$100,000 for the liquidation of the program. That was, of course, before the agreement between the United States and Mexico expired on December 31, 1953, and we have not had an agreement since that date.

I am glad to report to the House, Mr. Chairman, that the new agreement between the United States and Mexico was signed last night. I had hoped to be able to report to the committee that the President had signed the joint resolution that was passed by both the House and the Senate to make this program operative on a unilateral basis. I checked a few moments ago and it has not yet been signed, but I have reason to believe that it will be signed before the day is over.

In order to operate this program for the remainder of the fiscal year 1954, the Department of Labor came before our subcommittee and asked for \$550,000. After the resolution was reported by the Committee on Agriculture and was passed by the House and Senate, we held hearings on the request for this appropriation. At that time, the Department of Labor, which administers this program, admitted that they could handle it for \$72,000 less because of the fact that the station at Harlingen, Tex., had been closed.

The subcommittee reported to the full committee a total of \$478,000 for this

appropriation which is now before the House.

In all fairness, I wish to state that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] has been in touch with me in an effort to have this appropriation increased for the reason that there is no station on the United States side of the border in what is known as the Hidalgo district.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] is not here today because it was necessary for him to return to Texas. I am advised that the people in his district honored him at a testimonial dinner last night in appreciation of the fine manner in which he has represented them in the United States Congress.

This appropriation is very necessary to provide what is known as stoop labor in this country. All sections of the country will be affected if this appropriation is not granted.

The department has only enough money to continue this program until the 12th of this month, which is tomorrow. It is, therefore necessary that we act promptly.

The subcommittee and full committee acted on the appropriation request within 24 hours. It was the intention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], as well as myself, to bring this up for consideration last Friday under a unanimous consent request. We learned, however, that an objection would be made from the other side of the aisle; therefore, we went before the Rules Committee that afternoon to get a rule.

I trust the entire amount of this appropriation will be granted.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 19 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the subcommittee stated, this resolution calls for an appropriation of \$478,000 to carry out the provisions of a joint resolution that was adopted by this House a week ago last Tuesday for the rest of this fiscal year or until June 30, 1954. It has to do with the so-called Mexican farm labor program.

I voted against the resolution last week, I have voted against this kind of legislation during the past several years because it is legislation that I just do not like; however, by a majority of 100 votes, I think, in the House, the legislation was adopted a week ago last Tuesday and I am not now going to oppose the appropriation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. As I understand it, the President has withheld his signature from House Joint Resolution 355. It has not been approved as yet by the White House. I suppose the gentleman knows that the agreement between the Mexican Government and the American Government was signed in Mexico City last night; so the international agreement which I have been insisting upon has now been consummated. I assume that the President under such circumstances will not sign the bill. The administration now has the agreement which is contemplated by law. I assume the

money will be needed to carry out the agreement. I should also like to say that I do not intend to oppose this appropriation but I do want to reserve the right to examine this program more thoroughly at some time in the future.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is my understanding that regardless of whether the President signs the resolution passed by the Congress last week or we reach an agreement with Mexico under the old law, Public Law 78, this amount of money will be needed in either case.

Some mention was made of the fact that this resolution was going to be brought up last Friday, that there was going to be some objection from this side. I understand there was to be some objection although it was not going to be raised by me. The main reason for the objection was that here we were going to ask the House to appropriate money because of a resolution that had not been signed into law by the President of the United States. As far as I know up until this time he has not signed the resolution, although this agreement was consummated some time last night between our State Department and the officials of Mexico.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the authorization for this appropriation has not been signed into law by the President as yet?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. What I meant to say was that if our country and Mexico had not reached an agreement last night, and they have, this appropriation covers that agreement, but if they had not reached it we would be voting on an appropriation bill here today that is not authorized by law, because the President up to this time has not signed the resolution that passed this House and the Senate only last week.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. There is no question as to the authority for the appropriation, is there?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, because the authority exists under the old law, Public Law 73, I think it is, that was passed by a preceding Congress.

Now, I am going to support this appropriation because I have always believed that when Congress speaks, when they vote on an authorization, that it is up to the Committee on Appropriations, after suitable hearings have been held, to report back to the Congress and allow sufficient appropriations to carry out the law or the dictates of the Congress. I have always believed in that responsibility. I do not believe in being a member of the Committee on Appropriations, after the House has acted sometimes by unanimous vote, to sit on the Committee on Appropriations and then say as one member of that committee that the House was wrong after it unanimously adopted legislation in a preceding Congress, or in that particular Congress. I have in mind other appropriations that we take up from year to year, such as the Hospital Construction Act.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I was just simply going to say that the gentleman should be commended for that attitude which he has always demonstrated in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Do I understand that this fund is to be spent by the Department of Labor?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right, with some funds for the Public Health Service, for their part in the health program of these people coming across.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Has enough testimony been adduced by the subcommittee to determine whether the Federal Government's coordination of the various welfare services by the States and localities is adequate? I would like the gentleman to address himself to that phase of this program, because I shared some of the apprehensions that the gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentleman from North Carolina expressed when this legislation was originally considered.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I understand the question, the gentleman asked me whether or not the subcommittee or the committee has heard enough testimony as far as health and the welfare of these individuals is concerned, or their children.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. For the children and the families of the workers. I am referring to this related problem of the welfare of people for whom the Federal Government has a certain responsibility.

Mr. FOGARTY. As far as the Mexican labor program is concerned, as far as I remember and as far as I know, the committee did not give much consideration to that phase of it, no.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman agree that we probably need to take a look at that part of our program? In other words, the gentleman recognizes that there was a valid basis in the neglect of these services for the objection that was raised to the legislation. Now, I voted for the bill. I felt that it should be resolved on the basis of a severe economic condition, the labor was needed, and the Mexican laborers needed the employment. I hope I have not oversimplified it in my own thinking. What I am trying to say now is that the Federal Government should carry out the recommendations that have previously been made with reference to coordinating these welfare services so that there will be no objection to this program from the standpoint of the human values that are involved.

Mr. FOGARTY. I might say that I agree with the gentleman 100 percent and I might also add that in Public Law 78 they do have some protection. These Mexican farm laborers have more protection and better health standards are

being provided for them than are provided for our own migratory farm laborers in this country. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, because I think one of the most incomprehensible things that exists in this country today is the neglect of the children of our farm migratory workers that emanate from the South and work north in the crop seasons in the various sections of the country.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. This is not money spent in behalf of American workers.

Mr. FOGARTY. No. This is just for the Mexican farm-labor program, and the law gives these people better protection than we do our own in that particular area. A year ago the Bureau of the Budget recommended some \$100,000 to set up a pilot program to take care of the children and dependents of our own migratory workers in this country. The committee did not see fit to go along with it, and this year again we are being asked to appropriate \$100,000 for this program to do something about these second- or third-class citizens. That is what they are called in these various areas because when they go into these cities and towns, they are not wanted. The President of the United States said a short time ago he did not want any second-class citizens in this country. If there is such a thing as a second-class citizen or a third-class citizen, it is the children or the dependents of these migratory workers. I think the average wage of a migratory worker in this country today is about \$700 a year. How in the world any individual can exist, let alone live, on an average wage of \$700 a year is more than I can understand.

So I hope that when this bill comes before the House in a matter of 7 or 8 weeks, when we ask the House to do something about the plight of the dependents and children of migratory workers, the House will not forget that you are appropriating today in this bill some \$478,000, that you will not forget the purpose of this appropriation, and that you will give some consideration to the dependents of our own migratory workers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I should like to point out, in connection with the gentleman's speech, that I agree with what he has said with reference to the protection which has been and will be accorded these Mexican farm laborers. They are protected by virtue of the terms of the contract which provides them with sick and accident insurance and even burial insurance. But we have a problem right here at home, our own migratory workers who go from one State to another. They are the ones who are dragging these little children around from one ditch bank or one irrigation canal to another. I understand that the Mexican workers who are brought over are adult male workers and if there are any families that come with Mexican workers from Mexico, they are here as wetbacks.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of California. I just wanted to bring out the same point, that there are no families brought in under this agreement, these are only male workers.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thought I made that point clear. The point that I was trying to make was that we have this condition in our own country, with our own people and we are not doing a thing about it. They are worse than second-class citizens. If there is such a thing as a third-class citizen, that is what they are.

I should like to make this further point. Even though I opposed this legislation, I am supporting this appropriation today. I can think of 2 or 3 other matters I am going to speak on at a later date. I was not here last year when Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, which were for the maintenance and operation of school districts in federally impacted areas and the construction of schools in federally impacted areas, were approved by a unanimous vote of this House. As I read the RECORD, there was not one dissenting vote cast against the extension of those two acts.

What good has been accomplished by the action of the House of last year when the Department of Education refuses to carry out the dictates of Congress by asking the Bureau of the Budget for a sufficient amount of money to carry out those dictates, or when Congress itself refuses to entertain an appropriation to carry out the purposes of those acts?

I think that when Congress by a unanimous vote acts to extend a school-construction law that means that we will pay a certain percentage of the cost of schools in federally impacted areas, we are morally responsible and morally bound to these school areas and school districts to provide the funds that we told them we were going to provide when we passed the original legislation.

In a matter of a few weeks, when we have a deficiency or a supplemental bill, I am going to give this House an opportunity of voting for sufficient funds to carry out the action which they took last July or August when the House amended and extended these two public laws for aid to education.

That is one of the areas I had in mind when I said that as a member of the Appropriations Committee I believe we are bound to listen to the intent of Congress when a law is passed. I do not believe that as a committee we have the responsibility or the authority to say "No" to a unanimous vote of the entire Congress.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Since we are discussing the problem of provision for migratory workers and their families, it seems to me that some emphasis should be placed on the coordination function. In advocating participation by the Federal Government, we are not suggesting that the Federal Government take over the functions of local and State agencies

in meeting these conditions to which the gentleman refers. He would join, I am sure, in that observation. But would the gentleman point out that some good examples have been set for us in actions of local communities and State governments in the handling of this great social problem which we tend to neglect?

Mr. FOGARTY. The one project that was pointed out to us a year ago and again this year was Hoopeston, Ill. The people there got together 2 or 3 years ago—the clergymen and the educators and all of the interested persons, including the chamber of commerce—and they got up some kind of a program that has worked and will work, the Department thinks, on an areawide basis where this migratory labor problem exists. The trouble with a program like that is that unless the Federal Government takes the leadership and establishes a pilot program that can be followed by these areas that have this kind of help, they are not going to do it themselves. It was testified that we may have to be in this program for only a couple of years or 3 years at the most to provide a pilot program for these areas to follow—the States and the communities. When that is done, then the Federal Government would get out.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is it not also true that this town of Hoopeston, Ill., does a wonderful job of taking care of the migrant labor of that community entirely on its own without any assistance or help from either the State of Illinois or the Federal Government?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is absolutely right. It is the only town in the country that has done it, I think. Unless the Federal Government does something about it, we are not going to have any other towns do it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Referring to the gentleman's remarks on the school construction program and the school maintenance program, Public Laws 815 and 874, did I get the right impression from the gentleman from Rhode Island when he was talking about the fact that if the Congress passes this legislation we should appropriate the money, and do away with the Appropriations Committee and their functions entirely?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I am sure my remarks would not show that. I tried to point out to this House that I do not think we as a committee can set ourselves above the Congress of the United States and say "No" to the unanimous vote of the Congress. I do not think the gentleman or I or any other member of the Appropriations Committee has the right to say "No" to the wishes of the majority of this Congress or any other Congress. That is the point I was trying to make.

Mr. BUSBEY. I got the impression that if a piece of legislation was passed by the Congress and it authorized the expenditure of so much money, then the Congress ought to appropriate that money. If that is the fact, then we need no Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to advise the Members of the House that the officials of our Government and the officials of the government of the Republic of Mexico have composed all differences and have signed and executed an agreement compatible with the letter and the spirit of the existing law. By the terms of the agreement Mexican farm laborers will be made available for work on farms in the United States when the appropriate officials of the Department of Labor have certified that American citizens are not available to perform such work.

Here is a United Press story from Mexico City which brings us the good news and which I would like to read to you. Here is the story headlined "United States-Mexico Sign Pact on Workers":

The United States and Mexico signed a new 2-year agreement last night permitting recruitment of Mexicans for work on American farms.

The agreement was signed in Mexico City by United States Ambassador Francis White and Mexico's acting Foreign Minister Jose Gorostiza. It renews with some changes an agreement which expired last January 15.

The new agreement will run until December 31, 1955. It eliminates the need for legislation rushed through Congress last month which would have authorized this country to recruit Mexican workers at the border on its own.

President Eisenhower had delayed signing the legislation because of the imminence of the new pact and because of charges the measure would be a kind of club to force Mexico into an agreement on United States terms.

The new agreement changes the old pact to open a new recruiting station at Mexicali, and stations at Monterrey and Chihuahua will be reactivated. This is in response to a United States request for recruiting stations near the border.

Last night, just 4 weeks ago, on the evening of February 10, negotiations were resumed in Mexico City. Last night at 8 o'clock the agreement was signed. I am certain that Members of the House will recall that from the very beginning I have insisted upon a delay of the consideration of House Joint Resolution 355 in the hope that negotiations would be resumed and that an international agreement would be ultimately consummated. I tried in vain to prevail upon my committee to delay consideration indefinitely to the end that negotiations might be resumed and an agreement reached in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding. I delayed action in the Committee on Agriculture and I think I delayed action in the Rules Committee. In fact, I used every legitimate parliamentary weapon at my command to delay action on the final resolution. The delay has now resulted in complete agreement between the two Governments, America and Mexico.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield briefly for a question?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Does the gentleman have any information or facts to the effect that the President has not signed this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. I am certain that the President has not signed the bill, and I hope very much that he will now veto it. I have been in almost constant communication with the White House and have frequently communicated with officials of the State Department. I think it would be a tragedy and most unfortunate if the President of the United States should sign and approve that resolution at this time, in view of the fact that an agreement has now been reached and that the President himself is the one person who is responsible for negotiations having been resumed, which negotiations have now resulted in a satisfactory agreement. The very purpose of the resolution was to bring the element of force into the picture. The resolution has been referred to as a weighted weapon. A weighted weapon is a blackjack. I have not been willing to believe that the good-neighbor policy of our Government is to be accomplished by the use of weighted weapons or blackjacks or any other instrument of force or intimidation. The agreement which has been reached will continue through 1954 and 1955. In this situation there is no earthly reason why the President should hesitate for one moment to veto this very objectionable resolution. Certainly there is no reason to believe that the resolution had any persuasive effect upon the officials of the Mexican Government, since we have known all along that such officials are anxious, at all times, to resume negotiations and to make every effort to compose differences. The approval of the resolution at this time would actually be a grave and gratuitous insult to our good neighbor south of the border, a good neighbor to be sure, one who from the very beginning has urged that negotiations not be terminated and who from the very beginning has urged that negotiations in good faith be continued in the hope that an agreement could be reached.

On the afternoon of February 10 President Eisenhower expressed the hope that negotiations might be resumed immediately and that very night negotiations were resumed in Mexico City, and exactly 1 month later, on the night of March 10, all difficulties had been composed and an agreement had been consummated, signed, and executed by officials of the two Governments. It seems to me that all of us should now be satisfied and actually delighted. Landlords who need labor will now be able to recruit labor from south of the border, if necessary certification is made by officials of the Department of Labor. All of this can now be done in a manner compatible with the letter and spirit of the law now on the books. In such circumstances certainly we should not now attempt to rewrite that law or to change in any way the philosophy of the law under which we had very successfully operated this labor recruitment program for the past several years. Again I repeat, I hope that the President will veto House Joint Resolution 355.

In my recent study of this entire program in the light of present circumstances I doubt very much the wisdom of continuing the program in operation.

In the days to come this program should be carefully scrutinized and evaluated. Frankly, we should give serious consideration to our own migratory-labor problem and to the employment problem of our own Nation.

I desire to again call attention to an article in the New York Times of Friday, March 5, 1954, which was inserted in the Record on that date by our colleague, JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York. This article indicates very clearly that House Joint Resolution 355 is very well calculated to disturb our very friendly relationship with the people of the Republic of Mexico.

#### MEXICO EXPECTS NEW HIRING PACT—UNITED STATES BILL ON BRACEROS STIRS CRITICISM—MUTUAL PLAN UNDER OFFICIAL STUDY

MEXICO CITY, March 4.—The Mexican Foreign Office announced today that no more than the drafting of details was required for a satisfactory completion of the new agreement to send migrant workers to the United States.

The announcement took note of passage yesterday of a bill authorizing the United States to hire Mexicans on the American side of the border irrespective of whether Mexico agrees. The Foreign Office implied, however, that it was Mexico's hope that the bill, which has been passed by the House of Representatives, after Senate amendment, and now requires only Presidential signature to become law, will not actually go on the books.

The measure has stirred intense anger among unofficial groups here. The only Mexico City newspaper—*Novedades*—that had time to comment on the word from Washington that the bill had passed, had this to say:

"The Republican Party has always used the policy of 'big stick.'"

Although it is considered here as virtually certain that President Eisenhower will sign the bill, the Mexican Government said in a statement that "Senate passage does not mean it is already a law." The Government attitude was thus felt to be fairly moderate since the agreement expected next week would make a dead letter of bills for a unilateral contracting provision.

#### AGREEMENT IS HOPED FOR

The official statement also said that "high Foreign Ministry officials are continuing talks with the United States Ambassador, Francis White, an atmosphere of cordiality and mutual respect, which has, at all times, taken account of our fundamental purpose of assuring satisfactory protection to Mexican workers who go to labor in the fields of the neighboring country."

The last agreement—providing for the contracting of 200,000 Mexicans a year to work on American farms—expired on January 15. Negotiations to renew this pact collapsed when Mexico refused to modify it to meet a demand by the United States for a free hand in setting wages and working conditions for the migrants—or braceros as they are known.

The United States then began to hire them on the American side of the border. This lasted only a short time because of the United States Comptroller General's ruling that funds could not be used in this way without specific congressional approval.

#### PROVISIONS IN THE NEW BILL

The new bill that has been sent to the White House provides both the funds and the authorization for the United States to hire braceros without Mexico's consent unless a new pact is signed.

The current negotiations for a hiring agreement started about 3 weeks ago.

Neither the Mexican Government nor the American Embassy would give any details

as to the prospective new agreement. But indications are that it will be a compromise to satisfy basic Mexican demands, except for a provision that, in effect, would allow Mexican consuls to set minimum wages for the braceros.

The editorial in *Novedades* answered the thesis—supported spotlily among American officials here—that a new agreement is now close to signature as a result of pressure exerted on Mexico by the introduction and passage of the unilateral contracting bill.

"It is foolish, sheer ignorance of what our country is, to imagine that a North American law, even though conceived, proposed, and approved to exercise undue pressure on decisions of our Government, can influence it to modify our position of legitimate defense of our citizens in favor of dealers in braceros—who seem to have forgotten they are compatriots of Lincoln," the *Novedades* editorial said. The newspaper continued that the law did not "favor the United States, but only these dealers in braceros."

Although much heated comment has been stirred here over the braceros' issue, the whole discussion is overshadowed by a sense of futility because of the wetbacks that are in the picture. Wetbacks are the illegal migrants who have no protection from anyone. They stream across the border at the rate of about five to each properly contracted bracero.

Two groups, however, are not different sets of people. They all are Mexican workers who, if they can't get across the border with certified documents and Government help, go through intense hardships to do so anyhow.

#### BILL SENT TO PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON, March 4.—The House completed congressional action today on a bill to permit the United States to recruit Mexican farm workers at the border without Mexico's consent.

The measure now goes to the White House for President Eisenhower's signature. The House passed the measure earlier this week, but had to act again when the Senate made a minor change in the bill's wording.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, in response to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], it would make no difference whether the legislation to which he referred had been passed and approved by the President. The funds which are called for in the bill now before the House would be needed in either event.

The committee was faced with the problem that the Department of Labor would run out of funds on the 12th day of this month. If the program were to be continued, the previous legislation to which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has referred would have been necessary in order to retain the personnel to carry on the program, whether the legislation to which he referred eventually became law or not. The funds which are called for in the bill are necessary in either event, and the membership of the committee should be apprised of that fact.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I well recall the statements made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] when we had this legislation before us. If I understood him correctly and got the purport of what he was saying, he rather indicated that if we passed the resolution, somehow or other there would be a breakdown of the contract negotiations, and some terrible disruption of the peaceful and friendly relations between the United States and Mexico. It is certainly fair to observe at this time that neither of those results has occurred. On the contrary, the contract has been entered into, and as far as I know no violence has been done to the relations between the two countries. Some of us might claim with as much force as the gentleman from North Carolina might claim otherwise that the action we took did help in bringing about a completion of agreement which is the thing I argued for when the resolution was before us.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to observe: The fact remains this resolution—House Joint Resolution 355—has been on the desk of the President for exactly 1 week; and the President, in the exercise of good judgment, has not signed it. I think he has withheld his signature in the hope that the agreement would be reached. That is all I am concerned about.

Mr. HALLECK. I am not in a position to say why he withheld it any more than is the gentleman. I have not talked with him. I am willing to leave it to his judgment as to what should be done with the resolution. All I am saying is that what was done, in spite of the ominous warnings of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], has turned out very well.

Mr. COOLEY. But the fact remains the President has not signed the bill, and I hope very much that he will veto it immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I am in support of the bill before us today. I rise only to point out to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] that, while he does not like what he calls the unilateral features of the bill, he is making a perfectly unilateral statement because certainly the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and a majority of the Members of the Congress do not agree with him. The President was not expected to sign this bill until next Monday night. The Secretary of State, within the last few hours, has said it is still necessary to sign it. The Attorney General has felt that at all times. As a result of the passage of that bill, I feel today that the favorable terms of the agreement between Mexico and the United States, containing those provisions which take care of the Mexican farmers who live along the border, would

probably not have come out as satisfactorily as they did.

To conserve my time and that of the House, I include a release from the State Department which gives a brief outline of what is contained in the new agreement:

#### EXCHANGE OF NOTES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO ON FARM LABOR

The Mexican Ministry of Foreign Relations and the United States Department of State today made the following joint statement:

Today at 8 p. m., eastern standard time, in Mexico City, an exchange of notes took place between the Ministry of Foreign Relations and the United States Embassy which the two Governments consider as an agreement between them. This agreement renews from this date and until December 31, 1955, the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended on May 19, 1952, and as now modified by the terms of the joint interpretations and amendments in the notes under reference.

In view of this agreement, the two Governments wish to express their mutual satisfaction at having reached an amicable understanding, as a result of which the problem of temporary emigration of Mexican agricultural workers to the United States will continue to be governed by a mutually satisfactory bilateral agreement.

#### SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL POINTS COVERED IN EXCHANGE OF NOTES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO ON FARM LABOR

The notes exchanged between the United States and Mexican Governments in Mexico City on March 10 renewed the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951 until December 31, 1955. They also clarified the agreement and brought about certain changes which were mutually deemed necessary to improve the operation of the agreement and to reduce the flow of illegal workers into the United States. Principal provisions of the new understanding are as follows:

1. Wages paid to Mexican workers in the United States under the agreement may not be less than the prevailing wages for domestic laborers performing the same activity in the same area of employment as determined by the United States Secretary of Labor. Provision is made for the Mexican Government to protest and present evidence where it believes the wage determination to be inaccurate.

2. The contracting of workers will not be interrupted during investigation and solution of differences which might arise in connection with the operation of the program.

3. Subsistence allowances for Mexican workers are to be established at rates adequate to meet the cost in the area of employment of diets which the United States Department of Agriculture considers necessary for persons performing arduous labor.

4. Off-the-job insurance at the workers' expense is provided to cover workers suffering injuries, illnesses, or death. Standard form policies will be established which may be underwritten by any properly licensed insurance company offering competitive rates. The Mexican Government reserves the right to institute a plan for off-the-job insurance to be managed by a Mexican Government authorized organization.

5. Entire counties will no longer be included in the list of areas which are unacceptable for the employment of Mexican labor because of discrimination in a particular community. Individual employers will be placed on ineligible lists only as a result of joint determination by both Governments.

6. Workers who do not complete their contracts will receive return transportation and subsistence costs from the employer in the same proportion as the period worked compares with the length of the contract.

Employers may postpone from one payday to the immediately following payday a total of 3 days' earnings of a worker.

7. A new migratory station for the recruitment of workers will be opened at Mexicali, Baja California, and the stations at Monterrey and Chihuahua are to be reactivated. The other migratory stations provided in the agreement are at Durango, Irapuato, and Guadalajara. A United States reception center at Hidalgo is planned to replace that formerly at Hazelton, Tex.

8. Workers who were contracted in the United States during the period from January 16 and February 8, 1954, may, if they desire, be covered at the expiration of their contracts by new contracts under the renewed agreement.

9. A Joint Migratory Labor Commission composed of representatives of the interested Departments of the two Governments has been established to function until October 31, 1954. This Commission will observe the migrant-labor movement between Mexico and the United States in both its legal and illegal aspects and make recommendations to the two Governments for possible improvement in the operation of the agreement and for methods of deterring the illegal traffic. The Commission will also study the advisability of reducing the minimum contracting period for Mexican workers from 6 to 4 weeks, and make appropriate recommendations within 30 days. The Commission will also study and make recommendations concerning other problems which are referred to it by the Governments.

10. New negotiations may be entered into within 30 days after the final recommendations of the Joint Commission in order that the Governments may consider applying these recommendations to the operation of the program.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I will say that as a result of the interval, during which we were able to take care of these workers along the border, in a series of 110 investigations the Immigration Service found only 10 illegals. We told you the bill would meet the illegal situation, and it did so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, whether the President does or does not sign House Joint Resolution 355, which is now on his desk, we all do know that it served a good purpose through the fact that it was passed and sent to the President. I earnestly hope the President will sign it.

As the gentleman from North Carolina said a moment ago, the press announced today that an international labor agreement was concluded on yesterday with the Republic of Mexico. I think we have every reason to feel that the passage of House Joint Resolution 355 had a lot to do with expediting the making of the agreement. The details of that international agreement have not been revealed—that is, I have not seen the details except that the press reports the Republic of Mexico agrees to establish three border recruiting stations within reasonable proximity of the Rio Grande and the border of California. Even at that I fear the recruiting stations will not be close enough to the border.

It will be recalled that one of the points which blocked agreement previously was Mexico's insistence on having

border recruiting stations down 800, 1,000, or 1,500 miles in the interior of Mexico. That would, of course, encourage influx of wetbacks. Our representatives would not agree to go that distance into Mexico and insisted on their being somewhere in the vicinity of the border. The Republic of Mexico has finally agreed to that, though I fear the stations will not be close enough.

Now that the resolution is at the White House the President has until Monday to act upon it. I earnestly hope myself that he signs it. It certainly will be constructive; it will be helpful in the further relationships with Mexico in the interpretation and the functioning of the new international agreement.

We know from experience that under the old international agreement Mexico interpreted the agreement in some respects in direct conflict with the wording of the pact. It is very well for us to have our own immigration laws, our own labor laws, so we can make use of them if the occasion should arise in the future.

The passage of House Joint Resolution 355 has served a good purpose in helping to get an agreement with Mexico. But, regardless of that, the legislation is sound and should be on the statute books.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island have any further requests for time?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the following sum:*

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

*Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program*

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program," \$478,000.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. J. Res. 461) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 464, he reported the resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SOIL CONSERVATION AND WATERSHED PROGRAMS

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 454 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6788) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to reconsider.*

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE]. I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order consideration of the bill (H. R. 6788) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes.

This is an open rule providing for 2 hours general debate, the time to be divided equally between the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the ranking minority member of that committee.

This bill comes to the House by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Agriculture. This legislation was recommended by the President of the United States in a message to Congress dated July 31, 1953.

This bill authorizes what has commonly been referred to as the upper watershed program. The bill does not amend any existing legislation but provides for an entirely new soil-conservation and flood-control program which will be fully explained by the committee in general debate.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of interest in this legislation in every section of the country. There is a strong feeling that the Federal Government and local interests should cooperate in these small upstream projects, and that there will be substantial benefits therefrom. Last year we appropriated the sum of \$5 million for experimental work on this type of program and I understand the results have been very satisfactory.

I am for this legislation and hope that the rule will be adopted.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, is this an open rule?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 30]

Adair	Dawson, Ill.	McCarthy
Barden	Dingell	Mahon
Barrett	Donohue	Morgan
Battle	Fallon	Natcher
Becker	Fine	O'Brien, Ill.
Bentley	Forrester	Patten
Bentsen	Gregory	Perkins
Bow	Hart	Philbin
Boykin	Hébert	Powell
Brumblitt	Heller	Rains
Buckley	Holifield	Rivers
Celler	Javits	Roberts
Chelf	Jensen	Shelley
Chudoff	Kearney	Sutton
Clardy	Kelly, N. Y.	Teague
Cole, N. Y.	Keogh	Watts
Condon	King, Calif.	Weichel
Corbett	Kirwan	Widnall
Coudert	Klein	Wilson, Tex.
Curtis, Mo.	Krueger	Wolcott
Davis, Tenn.	Lantaff	Yorty

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### SOIL CONSERVATION AND WATER-SHED PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] for 15 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, while I am heartily in favor of this bill and feel it will pass without any difficulty, I have asked for this time to make a few observations on another subject, with the kind indulgence of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very much impressed with the vast amount of space devoted by the newspapers, radio, and television to the subject of communism. Following a recent appearance on TV and radio I was surprised by the letters that poured into my office from almost every State in the Union. It must be true that our people are keenly aware of the menace of communism. That is a healthy sign if it is not misinformed, if it does not reach the state of hysteria and does not become a political football; it is well for the safety of the Republic that our people are vigilant.

A very wise man once said: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Unfortunately, in America we are a nation of extremists; we go from one extreme to another. We were completely indifferent to this menace some 15 years ago. Today many people are laboring under false impressions and beliefs with respect to the gravity of this threat. It is in the hope that I can perhaps shed a little light upon it that I trespass upon your time.

The question that is asked me most frequently is: How great is this menace? And I want to answer that.

Let me tell you that in 1938 there were approximately 165,000 Communists, card-holding members of the Communist Party in the United States. That was not a great number; it did not compare with the membership in France and in many other countries. But the menace of the Communist never consisted in the numbers that belonged to the party. Their progress in this country was through the device known as the front organization. It was their ability to deceive gullible and unthinking Americans that enabled them to wield so much power in our Nation.

We are a nation of joiners. I recall when the Ku Klux Klan swept my State back in the twenties that literally scores of good Americans joined the Klan. They joined it to satisfy their curiosity or because they believed that they could accomplish good. Likewise, when the Communists set up several hundred front organizations with laudable objectives they found it easy to enlist the support of thousands of unthinking Americans.

As a matter of fact, the total claimed membership of the front organizations in the United States in 1938 was 10 million. It is difficult to believe that so many Americans would be careless in their affiliation with organizations concerning whose origin and purposes they were uninformed; but it is characteristic of our people to join organizations.

Nevertheless, it has always been essential that we keep in mind that the vast majority of people who joined these organizations were non-Communist, that they were not aware of the treasonable nature and purposes of the organization; therefore, in dealing with them we were constantly under the obligation to protect them from such exposure as would create the impression that they were members of the Communist Party. As soon as these people were properly informed the reaction differed with the individual. Many of them immediately quit the organizations. Some of them because of injured pride and because they did not want to confess that they had been so easily deceived preferred to attack those who exposed the true purposes of the organization. Nevertheless, as the result of exposure, most of these organizations went out of business and became more or less impotent by the year 1945. The party itself shrunk until today it numbers no more in the United States than it did 25 years ago. It has a hard core membership of approximately 24,000 Communists in the United States. Therefore, it follows, as a matter of common sense, that the menace

internally is far less today with an awakened and vigilant Nation than it was during the period we slept.

The Congress of the United States deserves a tremendous amount of credit for having apprised the people of the conspiratorial methods and deceptive tactics employed by the Communists. This House of Representatives steadfastly supported the investigation and exposure of un-American activities from their very inception. However, Mr. Speaker, if the people are misinformed to the extent that they are led to believe that in our country there is a vast element of our people who believe in communism, and if their fears are awakened to the point that approaches hysteria, and if innocent people who in their carelessness joined these organizations are pilloried, and persecuted, and held up to public scorn, a great deal of harm would be done.

I have believed that while we must constantly be vigilant, since the very nature of the Communist conspiracy is such that it can suddenly expand, that we have never been endangered by the threat of the Communists taking over the United States of America. To my mind the great danger was the ability of clever agents to exploit the credulity of the people. I do not believe that poverty played the leading factor in Communist recruiting in this country. No doubt, where people were poor and the fancied or real victims of discrimination, that was a contributing factor to their affiliation with the Communist movement; but of the 165,000 who joined the party and were members of the party in 1938, more than 100,000 of them voluntarily quit the Communist Party and of the claimed 10 million members of the front organizations, practically all of them quit.

Now we have the hard core with us, and we will have them with us for a long time to come. I have believed for many years that ultimately we must recognize what we are dealing with. From the very beginning of the Soviet dictatorship, western governments and public opinion have persisted in believing that we can do business with Russia. I have never believed it and do not believe it today. I think Russia means war, and that short of a miracle the free world must come to a showdown with Russia, and I base that opinion upon the many statements of the leaders of the Soviet Union from the very inception of the movement until the present time. Communists are bound by an ironclad doctrine. That doctrine contains an interpretation for every situation, and there never has been a cult since the beginning of time that held so rigidly to doctrine as the Communists. That doctrine is a combination of the teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, and in order to understand what they plan to do one must understand what that doctrine is. The very heart and core of that doctrine is world conquest. When that is removed from communism, the whole movement will collapse. It is the driving force; it is the one thing that holds in subjugation hundreds and thousands and millions of people. They have never departed from that strategy. From time to time they

have shifted their tactics. There was a period of the united front under which so many gullible people were enticed in the United States. That was a period in which they pretended that they were seeking democratic objectives by peaceful means. The tactics may change, but the objective, the broad strategy, remains today the same as it has ever been. It is essentially a criminal conspiracy, and for that reason men like Earl Browder and William Weiner were convicted of crimes, such as forging passports, or Dr. Burtan, who was sent to the penitentiary because he counterfeited United States money to serve the party. They have been guilty of almost every crime on our statute books, because they believe in the words of Lenin that a revolutionary who cannot combine every form of illegal procedure, with every form of legal procedure, is a poor revolutionary. The world is dealing with international gangsters, with people who are committed to the planning and the perpetration of crime. When we recognize this ugly truth and approach the problem realistically, then our country will be more secure.

I do not condemn our leaders for attempting to find some peaceful means—God knows all of us pray and hope that war may be prevented. I only say to you what is the result of a deep conviction that I do not believe that a dictatorship as ruthless as the Soviet Union, controlled and dominated by a man like Malenkov, who believes that he is a second Genghis Khan, can be restrained by reason or humanitarianism. I do not believe that there is enough room in the world for people who want to be free and people who have aspirations of human dignity to coexist indefinitely with a cult which is dedicated heart and mind and body and soul to the paramount objective of conquering the entire earth.

In 1929 Stalin addressed a group of American Communists who traveled to Moscow; and very frankly and boldly told them, in effect, that "yours is the decisive task. Go back to the United States. Do all you can to prepare for the moment when we must conquer America."

That was the substance of his declaration. So that when all the Communist leadership for 25 years have frankly and boldly said to us that "we cannot live with you in the same world, we cannot coexist and world communism cannot be secure or complete until such time as you are destroyed," I am compelled by cold logic to believe that in the words of Washington, "It is wise to prepare for the worst." In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, since this is a criminal conspiracy, since all of the courts have so found it, and since every congressional committee has concluded that it is a criminal conspiracy, why should we permit it to have legal status in the United States? And how can you deal with it as long as you recognize its legality?

Can you say that we can deal with Communist organizations when, under the laws of our land, they have the same right to exist politically as any other organization in our midst?

This is not child's play. This is a fight for keeps. We must understand,

as a people, that we live in one of the great watersheds of history. You and I will live to see that dreadful day when the forces of freedom, when nations who believe in the dignity and the rights of men, must call a halt to the ever-expanding ambitions of the Kremlin. Furthermore, when they reach a stalemate in their cold war and are no longer able, by deceit and guile and trickery, to extend their ruthless dominion, then they will resort to a hot war, a war that they are now feverishly preparing to wage.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely and seriously ask the Members of this House to join with me and bring out on the floor a measure which will say not only to our own people but to the world that this is a criminal, a treasonable conspiracy and as such it shall not be permitted to exist in the United States any more than organized murder or organized theft would be permitted to operate legally in our country.

I believe that by such a declaration we will be dealing with this question realistically. And I think it will be the end of the Communist conspiracy in our land. It may be true that the hard core will stay underground. It may be true that there will always be some Communist criminals in our midst. But the opportunity to do what they did from 1933, when we recognized Russia, up until 1945—the opportunity to establish or capture numerous front organizations with high-sounding names, and to exploit the faith and the hopes of idealistic people and to deceive men and women who did not think or did not investigate, and to build up a gigantic network of espionage and sabotage as window dressings behind which their clever agents could operate in our land will have been destroyed. They will take their places side by side with the criminals of our land.

More than that, Mr. Speaker, by our declaration the peoples of the world will understand that we who fought this menace for years and investigated it, we who have built up a mass of evidence that will fill this chamber, we who have been patient and careful and prudent, have come to the only conclusion that we could reach, that we are dealing with a criminal conspiracy, and that in the interest of freedom and decency we declare it to be what it is; and having declared it, we serve notice on the world of the wicked nature and purposes of the enemy that confronts us.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it might be worthwhile to add a footnote or two to the very eloquent, persuasive, and I think absolutely sound statement made by our colleague from Texas.

While the ultimate objective of the Communist world conspiracy unquestionably is conquest by force—and we should remember that it has never yet conquered any country, beginning with the Soviet Union, except by force of arms—the Kremlin would prefer, of course, to weaken its intended victims to the point of practical collapse before the final knockout blow by force.

To do that, it has all sorts of tricks in its bag. Lenin said, "We will use every ruse, every dodge, every trick, every cunning, every illegal method, every concealment, every veiling of the truth." Our very decency makes it hard for us to realize how diabolically clever and brazen are their tactics of deception.

In 1928 the Kremlin recognized that it could not win according to the basic doctrines of Karl Marx alone. You recall his thesis that the proletarian revolution was inevitable in industrialized countries. A few men with machines could produce so much goods that many would lose their jobs, there would be vast unemployment, unrest, and then revolution. But apparently Marx miscalculated, because the proletarian revolution predicted by him has not come in a single industrialized country, not one. Only in the industrially backward countries have the Communists won thus far.

So, in 1928 the Sixth World Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow adopted what is called "Theses on the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies and Semicolonies." This became its blueprint. From that time on the Communists gave major attention to the undeveloped countries and the weak governments of Asia.

War is the last stage in the Communist program, and we need not worry about world war with them unless or until we let them succeed in the first two stages.

The first stage is subversion. Whom can they subvert? They cannot subvert the strong. The gentleman from Texas has made clear how they tried to subvert this country and did not succeed. They cannot subvert Norway; they cannot subvert Switzerland. They can confuse, beguile, and weaken strong, stable countries a certain amount, but they cannot successfully subvert the strong.

Whom then can they subvert? The weak. So in 1928 they shifted their major attention to Asia, where a whole continent of people was struggling to gain freedom from European colonialism. I predict that when history is written it will record that one of the greatest victories Stalin ever achieved was in our minds, getting us to concentrate our attention almost exclusively on Europe while the Communist world was working day and night to try to get control of Asia—as the cheaper and surer way to get Europe and then ourselves. After the war it concentrated its attention even more upon the young struggling Republic of Korea, on defeated, disorganized, and weakened Japan, on the weakened government that was in China after hundreds of years of foreign domination, civil war, and 8 years of Japanese invasion, on the weak government in the Philippines when it got its independence simultaneously with the end of the Japanese occupation, plus all the destitution of war, on the young and weak governments in India, Burma, Vietnam, and Indonesia. For 100, 200, even 300 years under foreign control, able persons in these countries had not been permitted to rise to positions of real power and stature. When they finally won self-government, they had hardly

more than a handful of persons experienced in government. Because their basic problems were so inherently difficult, they offered the best opportunities for Communist intrigue and propaganda to make headway. So Communist subversion has been most active and successful in Asia, and now also in Africa, and some parts of Latin American, where there are relatively unstable governments. Subvert the weak.

The second stage, of course, is to divide the strong, and that is what they have been trying to do, and unfortunately, are doing with considerable success in Europe.

Their program is to subvert the weak, mostly in Asia, and divide the strong, mostly around the North Atlantic. Then and then only will come the day when they go to war, if they need to, for the final knockout blow. We have to understand this clearly if we are to deal successfully with the problems they present to us, and not fall into their traps as we have done so often in the past.

In the last year of his life Stalin made three major statements—two were in essays published in the Soviet Union in February and May of 1952, and the third his final public address, before the World Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow in October and November of 1952. It was the first World Congress held since the war. They do not hold these congresses, with leaders called in from all over the world, except when there is something of the greatest importance to announce. It was at the 1928 congress where they shifted their major efforts to Asia, and it was at the 1935 congress where they shifted to the united front tactics. They saw Japan's power coming up on one side and Hitler's coming up on the other side. Mother Russia was threatened. So they shifted from methods of agitation and violence against democratic countries and organizations to the tactic of forming coalitions with the democratic forces against the "fascists"—the united front technique of which the gentleman from Texas spoke.

So when they called the first World Congress since the war in the fall of 1952, everybody should have known that it was to be of the greatest significance. What did Stalin say? He laid down essentially the same line in all three last statements of his life:

First. The most important event in World War I was the subtraction of the Soviet Union from a single world market.

Second. The most important event in World War II was the subtraction of Eastern Europe, what we called the satellite countries and they, of course, call the friendly democracies, from a single world market.

Third. The most important event since World War II has been the subtraction of China from a single world market. Now, he said, in substance, the remaining world market is not adequate for the capitalistic powers. Therefore, it is inevitable that there will be wars between the capitalistic nations over the division of the remaining world market. So the Communist forces around the world could and should shift their major

effort from military measures to economic, political, and propaganda measures. That was the basic shift that Stalin announced in the fall of 1952. He was saying, "We have it won, comrades; we do not have to go to war now. Just hang on to what we have got in Asia; maintain the pressures on the weak countries to keep them weak; stall the timetables along in Korea and keep the little wars going in Indochina and Indonesia and Malaya and Burma and India, and so on. Break them down from the inside, and then get the strong, industrialized countries to quarrel among themselves about markets and trade, as we and some of our European allies are doing at the moment. Disintegration of the West is inevitable, comrades, if we play it smart. Victory is at hand."

Mr. Speaker, we cannot ignore the possibility that history may prove Stalin correct, unless we, too, play it smart. What do we have to do to defeat their diabolical plans and devices? First, do not let them subvert the weak. How can we keep them from subverting the weak? By helping the weak to become strong. How? Not by just giving them commodities or money, but by all the many ways which will help them to become able to stand on their own feet, individually and as a group. Second, we must do the best we can to prevent them from dividing the strong. This may be even more difficult. The heart of our foreign-policy problem today is this two-pronged task: How to hold together and strengthen the alliance of democratic powers around the North Atlantic and, at the same time, prevent the loss of Asia piece by piece to the Communists. Or, putting it the other way, how to keep the pressure on against Communist forces in Asia, embargo on trade, nonrecognition of Communist China, and so forth, so that they do not take over the relatively weak governments there, and at the same time prevent division and disunity among the allies around the North Atlantic, some of whom want us to let Asia go, thinking that they will get more aid for themselves. That is the difficult dual task that we must accomplish if we hope to avoid the day when a showdown comes in all-out war. If it does come, I think we can win it. We certainly are not going to surrender. But it will be at the cost of the destruction of precious values in our society and the wealth-producing capacities and all the other things that have made America great, destruction which we cannot even contemplate.

America has to recognize that this ultimate objective of the Communists never changes; the objective is fixed—it is world conquest. The strategy never changes; it is fixed—it is world revolution. But the tactics are totally fluid. They are changed, even reversed, with the greatest ease.

How brilliant those tactics are we have seen illustrated within the last year. They knew early that they could not win in Korea. Lenin had said, When you have to accept a defeat, make it look as if it is a victory; if you must retreat, camouflage it as an advance.

So when they could not win in Korea, and it was no longer a profitable operation, their problem was how to get out of it without letting it look like a defeat for them; or, better, how to make it look in Asia like a defeat for us and a victory for them.

Second, Communist China was in trouble. It had become overextended and was so strained by the Korean war that an increase of 10 percent in our effort could have forced China to the breaking point. So they wanted to end the drain, to get Communist Chinese forces back into China to put down the growing resistance movements there and to move down into southeastern Asia for more profitable operations than Korea.

Third, Stalin died. They needed a breathing spell in order to tend to their homework in the Kremlin. Who was to be the new top dog?

Fourth, there was a new administration in Washington, and the first act of the new President was to take our fleet out of the Formosan Straits where, incredibly, they were protecting the coastline of the Communists.

Here was Communist China conducting 2 wars—1 up in this peninsula, Korea. The other down in this peninsula Indochina. There was Formosa right off China's middle, the most valuable piece of real estate in Asia from which to make trouble for the enemy, fighting as it was on two widely separated fronts. So when the Communists observed that act by our new President, they obviously said, "This man was a pretty good general. America could have won this war in Korea anytime it wanted to. He might decide to do it. We have got to calm America down."

The Communists were in trouble in Korea. They were in trouble in Moscow. They were in trouble in China. They were in trouble in Washington. So what did they do to relax us? The first thing was to have Vishinsky smile, shake hands and say, "Now let us work together for peace." Away went 25 percent of our resolve. It did not cost them anything except a smile.

Second, they let out 135 or so American prisoners. Away went another 25 percent of our resolve. That did not cost them anything either. They had been saving them for that very purpose. They doubtless have some more held back to use for the same purpose again if they should need to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Thank you. We became so preoccupied with the return of our boys, because boys are precious to us, that we forgot to notice how skillfully they were diverting our attention from the main conspiracy.

Then they took another leaf out of Lenin's notebook. He had said whenever you are in trouble you can always count on the cupidity of the capitalists. So they called a world-trade conference in Moscow and held out tempting offers. Away went some more of the West's resolve. Our Allies rushed over to try to get some orders. The trade will not

amount to much in the end, but the results in softening the West and dividing the strong have already amounted to a great deal.

You see with what great skill they can shift their tactics, so that they can soften us up, get the Chinese Communists off the hook in Korea, and still get what was in fact a real defeat for them, presented to the world as a great victory, especially to those who are unfamiliar with the facts. They propose truce talks not because they have to; they propose a truce only because they are devoted to peace. And if we do not give them at conferences at Panmunjom or in Berlin or Geneva what they could not win on the battlefield, then we are terrible warmongers who are responsible for prolonging world tensions.

This is all so elementary that I half apologize for bringing it up, but at the same time it frequently astonishes me how many wonderfully good people will fall for it, the same people who fell for the United Front appeals for peace and democracy and against war and fascism during the thirties. You have all heard people say, "Well, Stalin is dead. There is a change, a new look, in the Kremlin. Perhaps Malenkov really wants peace and is genuinely conciliatory."

There is not a shred of evidence that the Kremlin has changed a single policy or doctrine in the slightest. Everything the Kremlin has done since Stalin's death has been in harmony with the new line he laid down the year before he died. They are carrying out in good faith exactly the shift in tactics which he had announced they were now in a position to do, because they had conquered one-third of the world, split the world market, and the remaining two-thirds would not be enough for the capitalist powers. They could afford to wait, keep the pressure on the free nations, and let them destroy each other in capitalist wars over the remainder.

We are, indeed, at one of the crossroads of history, or watersheds, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES] called it. The immediate test will not be a military one. It is a test of our maturity, our intelligence, our steadfastness, and our patience. Will we stick with the basic policies which, to the credit of Mr. Truman, were started in his administration in 1947, when, with the Republican 80th Congress—it was a genuinely non-partisan policy—America said, "Thus far and no further in Europe." If we will now have that kind of a steadfast policy in Asia and the Middle East, as well as in Europe, and sustain and strengthen that policy, not just by dollars but by resolution in our hearts, the forces on our side are the stronger. Late as it is, only two things could defeat us. One, if we should underestimate the enemy, and be lulled to sleep by his peace tactics. The other, if we should underestimate ourselves and the strength of the free peoples of the world, especially those behind the Iron Curtain, who are today the most valuable and most dependent ally we have, the ally that can do the most damage to the enemy, and one which we must not, under any circumstances, discourage, or undercut, or sell down the river

by any act that will strengthen the Communists anywhere.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] to speak on the rule.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today relates to resources. One of the greatest resources is our soil. If we in America do not do our part to save the remaining 3 inches of soil in this world in the next 200 years, there will be no soil.

I support this rule. Senator MONRONEY, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], and I have had similar pending resolutions for some time. I wish to commend the chairman and members of this committee for their action in bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, there is another great resource of this country that we need to think about, and that is the youth of America, the Boy Scouts, the 4-H Clubs, the FFA, and particularly the Girl Scouts of America. Tomorrow—that is, on March 12—the Girl Scouts of America will be 42 years old.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that this Nation should, on March 12, 1954, pay tribute to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. On March 12, 1912—42 years ago—Mrs. Juliette Gordon Low, of Savannah, Ga., founded this organization.

The idea of Scouting was already some 4 years old when Mrs. Low acted. The Boy Scout program had been initiated in England in 1908 by Sir Robert Baden-Powell. Girl Scouts, known as the Girl Guide movement, began a year later under the leadership of Sir Robert's sister.

It is evident that someone else might have originated Girl Scouting in this Country. History makes it clear for us that it is to Mrs. Low—not to anyone else—that the name of "founder" belongs.

She was 52 years old when her moment for action came. Her life up to that moment had prepared her for the course she was to take. She had been educated here and abroad. She had married an Englishman. Yet, she was well-founded in American thought. An ancestor of hers, a girl, had been captured by an Indian tribe at an early age and had lived with the Indians for 4 years. That ancestor, far from resenting her captivity, had enjoyed it. She passed down her Indian name—Little-Ship-Under-Full-Sail—and her appreciation of the first Americans. These became family traditions.

Mrs. Low was a loyal southerner. As a child, she had witnessed the siege of Savannah. Yet, she felt that all Yankees were not necessarily bad because her grandfather lived in Chicago. She loved him and her visits to his home were full of pleasant memories.

It was an act of Providence that she should number among her English friends Lord Robert and Miss Agnes Baden-Powell. Following through on the Girl Guides idea, she supervised the work of a troop in Scotland and two

troops in London. She learned that girls maintained interest in scouting whether they were city girls or country-born and country-bred. She learned that the desire of youth to associate together in work and play laughed at national boundaries. By the time she had decided to visit the United States in 1912, Girl Scouting had already spread to Denmark, Finland, Poland, and Germany, as well as to all British possessions.

Mrs. Low wanted to start Girl Scouting in the United States. There was nothing like it here. There was some opposition to the Baden-Powell movement among those who did not understand it. There were even greater obstacles to overcome. Guides meant nothing in American history: Scouts did. She would have to change the name and a great many things besides the name.

Hands Around the World, a book published in 1949 by the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, puts true emphasis on the struggles of Mrs. Low to convince Americans that "Scouting for girls is not the same as Scouting for boys."

There was little doubt that Mrs. Low was aware of the changes which would have to be made before Girl Scouting could be a success here, but she was convinced of the universal rightness of the movement itself.

The cable she sent her family in Savannah before she left England for America in 1912 indicates her powerful enthusiasm.

That cable read, "I am bringing home the biggest thing yet."

Nineteen hundred and twelve. Big events were in the making. China had just thrown over her century-old empire and had formed a republic. An uneasiness was stirring in the Balkans which was to eventually erupt into World War I.

Even as she set foot on her homeland, Mrs. Low was thinking, "One individual often does more than a whole government or an army. When you get an idea that will do good, follow it up and do not fear that, because it is only you, it cannot succeed."

This woman of decision had only been in Savannah for a few days, when she called her friend, Nina Pape, head mistress of a girls' school.

"Come right over, Nina," she said, "I've got something for the girls of Savannah and all America, and all the world, and we are going to start it tonight."

Mrs. Low did start it.

The original group was less than 10 in number. In 1915, there were 5,000 Girl Scouts. In 1919—right after World War I—there were 34,000. By 1944, the 32d anniversary of Girl Scouting, there were 850,000. Today, there are approximately a million and a half Girl Scouts in the United States. This latter figure is the active list. Graduate Girl Scouts number up in the millions. Mothers and daughters have already been members of the same organization. Someday soon, mothers, daughters, and grandmothers will have shared in the same experience.

Mrs. Low organized the first Girl Scout camp during the summer following the first meeting on March 12, 1912.

She was the prime mover and coauthor of the first Girl Scout handbook, *How Girls Can Help Their Country*. She was behind the formation of a national board, located in Washington, D. C., in 1915. When headquarters were moved to New York City, she kept right on devoting her time and tireless energy to Girl Scouting.

Her enthusiasm spread to others.

Brownie troops, Scouting for younger girls, had its start at Marblehead Neck, Mass., in 1916, under the superb guidance of women who knew the dream of Mrs. Low. Mrs. Woodrow Wilson became the first honorary president of our Girl Scouts in 1917. Since that time, the wife of each President of the United States has assumed that additional honor.

Mrs. Low was not wealthy. She exhausted her personal resources early in her crusade. She was even forced to sell priceless family heirlooms in order to keep on with her work.

As a girl, Mrs. Low's health had not been of the best. She was slightly deaf. Her deafness became more pronounced as she grew older. Her health, her lack of hearing, did not halt her in her many trips, her numerous lectures, her ceaseless publicizing of her fine cause.

March 12, 1954. What does it mean to 1½ million American girls? The promise:

On my honor, I will try to do my duty to God and my country, to help other people at all times, to obey the Girl Scout laws.

The laws are 10 in number:

A Girl Scout's honor is to be trusted; a Girl Scout is loyal; a Girl Scout's duty is to be useful and to help others; a Girl Scout is a friend to all and a sister to every other Girl Scout; a Girl Scout is courteous; a Girl Scout is a friend to animals; a Girl Scout is cheerful; a Girl Scout obeys orders; a Girl Scout is thrifty; and a Girl Scout is clean in thought, and word, and deed.

The slogan of these 1½ million girls is, "Do a good turn daily." Their motto is, "Be prepared!"

To these 1,500,000, Girl Scouting today means that they will be intelligent, friendly, loyal American women tomorrow.

It means the same thing to the nearly 500,000 volunteer and professional workers now engaged in Girl Scout programs, adults with the true interest of American girlhood at heart.

To Girl Scouts and to adult workers in Girl Scouting, March 12, 1954, means the 42d Juliette Low Day. It is meet and right that this be true.

Many years ago, Mrs. Low said, "If the program is not right, girls will not like it and it will not last."

The program must have been right, for it has lasted and grown. It is, at one and the same time, a blessing for American womanhood and a bulwark for American freedom.

We can all say, as if speaking to Mrs. Low herself, "We Americans are grateful to you. Yesterday you planted the seed which tomorrow will yield untold millions of the kind of American beauties your country needs most."

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to read a letter sent to my secretary from Girl Scouts of the United States of America, National Headquarters, 155 East 44th

Street, New York, N. Y., as a part of my remarks:

GIRL SCOUTS OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
March 10, 1954.

Miss MARGARET HUGHES,  
Secretary to Congressman Wickersham,  
New House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS HUGHES: Here is the information I gave you over the phone today when I called to express our pleasure at Congressman WICKERSHAM's intention of mentioning the Girl Scout 42d birthday on the floor of the House on Thursday, March 11, or Friday, March 12, and to offer our services in furnishing any material he might find useful or necessary.

Dedicated to helping girls develop as happy, resourceful individuals willing to share their abilities as citizens in their homes, their communities, their country, and the world, the Girl Scout organization reports current membership at an all-time high of more than 2 million—over 1,500,000 girls and some 500,000 adults. In this membership is included over 30,000 men, who pay dues and who are entitled to wear the trefoil emblem which is the common emblem of scouting throughout the world.

Open to all girls who subscribe to the Girl Scout promise and laws, the Girl Scouts of the United States of America is the world's largest organization of its kind.

An important current project of the national Girl Scout organization is helping bring the Scouts' wholesome program of fun and learning to girls who are on the move—daughters of construction workers who are beating a path from one enormous project to another to help build the new industrial marvels that are changing the face of America, and to the children of migrant agricultural workers. Realizing that children need a "sense of belonging" for healthy development, the Scouts have carried on pilot projects which have demonstrated that Scout membership opens the doors of friendship to girls who move into a strange community and try to put down roots for as long as father's job keeps them there. Through scouting, in fact, parents—both old residents and newcomers—find a common ground of interest, as they work together for the benefit of their daughters. Thousands of girls on the move now can find acceptance and friendship wherever they go, through Girl Scouting.

Another Girl Scout project which is winning praise is kits for Korea. This is a demonstration of friendship for children in war-torn Korea. Over the last few months, thousands of Girl Scouts have made little drawing bags and filled them with such small necessities as soap, face-cloth, writing and sewing materials. Delivered to American Relief for Korea, two tons of these kits already are on their way to boys and girls in far-off Asia.

We are delighted to have an opportunity of alerting Girl Scouts in the vicinity of Washington, D. C., to Congressman WICKERSHAM's intention of entering a mention of the Girl Scouts birthday into the proceedings on the floor of the House on Thursday or Friday. We already have so informed our regional office in Washington, and shall make every effort to insure attendance of Girl Scouts in the Visitors' Gallery. Thank you so much for having given us notification of this plan.

Cordially yours,

MARY HOWARD ELLISON,  
Public Information Division.

Also, I should like to read an article entitled "They Made a Promise," by the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.:

THEY MADE A PROMISE

One day you looked up and there stood your baby girl, straight and serious-faced,

in a uniform. And suddenly you realized that she wasn't your baby girl any more, that you hadn't played horsie for her in a long time, and you couldn't remember when you last carried her up the wooden hill to bed.

"I'm a Brownie Scout, daddy," she said. "See my pin, and look, this shows I belong to Troop 16, and I made a promise to love God and my country and to help others, and we're going to take hikes, and today Miss Alby showed us how to make things with clay, and when I'm 10 I'll get to be a real Girl Scout, and, and, and—"

When she had finally run out of breath you smiled, perhaps too indulgently, made an appropriate remark, and went back to reading your paper.

But that evening you noticed Mother had help carrying the dishes out to the kitchen. And Saturday morning a certain young lady made her bed without being told. And when you'd planned going up to the mountains over Memorial Day weekend, you were informed that it was more important that a Brownie make bouquets for our soldier boys who got killed. You had a pang of conscience when it hit you that some of those soldier boys were your own buddies from B Company. And you helped with the flowers, too.

And so Girl Scouting had begun to work its own particular wonders in your home, as it has in so many others. You watched its quiet influence through the years. And your respect for it grew. And more than once you gave a mental thanks to the tireless people who make such an organization live.

Today in our country there are over a million and a half girls in Scouting. That's a good thing to know. A good thing to think about when you get to wondering about the future. A million and a half little girls, keeping a sober promise to love God and their country and to help other people, can make a big difference in where we go from here.

JOHN HANCOCK MUTUAL  
LIFE INSURANCE CO.

BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker—  
Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my very good and able friend and colleague.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am grateful to the gentleman for his kind words. I was just wondering whether or not the gentleman intended to make some remarks about the legislation that is going to be before us made in order by this rule.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, I intend to talk about the legislation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am very glad of that.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say to the gentleman that what we are discussing is H. R. 6788, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, conservation and the intelligent use of our soil, water, and forest resources is vital to our continued economic well-being. Indeed, it may well be that our survival as a strong nation will depend in large part upon the man-

ner in which we make use of these basic resources. The need for the improvement of our soil and water resources and related renewable resources, is greater than at any other time in our history. Supplying the needs of our tremendously increasing population together with our part in meeting food and fiber needs the world over during the recent past has speeded the already heavy drains on our soil, water, and forest resources. In spite of present temporary surpluses in certain foods and fibers, the long-time trend in the demand for the products of the farm and of the forest will be upwards. We of 1954 who are entrusted with the stewardship of our irreplaceable soil and related resources must be looking to the future. I consider H. R. 6788 to be a forward looking measure which will enable us to maintain and in fact improve these vital resources.

This bill is designed to meet the urgent need for cooperative local-State-Federal action to protect and improve the soil and water resources of the Nation's small upstream watersheds in order to better control soil erosion, reduce floodwater and sediment damage, mitigate the effects of drought, and provide for efficient use of our soil, water, and forest resources on a sustained basis.

The need for H. R. 6788 does not minimize the fact that much has been and is being accomplished under our various existing Federal and State soil, forest, and water resource conservation and development programs. For example, more than 1,300,000 farmers and ranchers, operating about one third of the agricultural land of the United States, aided by the Soil Conservation Service and in cooperation with their local soil conservation districts have programs underway for the improvement of their soil and water resources. On these farms, about one-half of the planned conservation measures have been installed. An equally large number of farmers and ranchers are receiving help in soil, water, and forest conservation under other Federal and State programs such as the agricultural conservation program, the agricultural research programs, cooperative agricultural extension service and the several State forest services. The owners of forest and woodlands are benefiting from assistance made available for fire control under the Clarke-McNary Act and for technical forestry advice under the Cooperative Forest Management Act. Under the United States Forest Service our national forests have been administered on a sound conservation basis for many years.

In spite of this splendid record of resource conservation accomplishments under these existing programs much more remains to be done. The present programs now underway must continue, but in addition, something else needs to be done. To accomplish this, H. R. 6788 has been proposed. This bill is not suggested as a substitute for existing programs but rather for the purpose of strengthening the present programs. The increased interest in upstream watershed programs is primarily the re-

sult of the operation of present soil, forest, and water conservation programs.

H. R. 6788 provides a means whereby a completely rounded program of upstream watershed treatment can be developed. The very great interest that has been developing in rural areas in the whole subject of watershed protection and flood prevention can be brought into focus and developed into an effective cooperative force through this bill.

There is need to give greater emphasis to the conservation, control and productive use of water high up on the watershed lands. Here is the point of first productive use of water and here is the first opportunity to begin prevention of destructive floods. Recent studies show that over half of all the Nation's average annual flood damage occurs on the headwater streams and a large proportion of this damage is agricultural.

The Nation's program for resource development needs to give a more realistic emphasis to upstream watershed conservation and flood prevention. This does not mean, however, that necessary downstream flood control measures should be neglected. What it does mean is that there is an urgent need for a better balance between upstream watershed treatment and downstream flood control.

This watershed bill will provide the additional authority needed in the Department of Agriculture to assist the States, local organizations and local people with the conservation of their land and water resources. It would authorize, with initiative controlled by local people, and with appropriate individual-local-State-Federal cost-sharing, the coordinated extension of soil and water conservation assistance from the forested hilltops and the farm fields down through the small watercourses.

The bill would establish a pattern of watershed treatment cooperation covering entire watersheds. It is not just a farm land bill but will apply equally to forest lands and grasslands as well as to cropland. The program would assist in the conservation of the highly important forested watershed lands, which occupy one-third of the Nation's total land area, as well as the conservation of our croplands. It would be effective in the high water-yielding national forest areas of our western and eastern mountains. It would be of great help on the 57 percent of our country's forest land now owned by farmers. The bill would be of assistance on State-owned forest lands. Large forest land holdings and industrial forest areas which together constitute 18 percent of our Nation's total forest area would also benefit. I mention these important watershed areas to dispel any misconception that this bill would benefit farm lands alone.

In closing, I wish to emphasize that H. R. 6788 is a bill that merits the endorsement of all citizens really interested in the long-term welfare of our Nation. Not only does it provide for the improvement of our soil, forest and water resources but at the same time it calls for strengthening the bonds of local-State-Federal partnership in the resource conservation effort in such a

manner as to permit each to play its proper role.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6788) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6788, with Mr. CANFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes to the House in its present form by the unanimous vote of the members of the Committee on Agriculture. It comes here also as the result of a message from the President of the United States dated July 31 last year in which he asked the Congress to enact this legislation.

However, the bill has a longer history than that because it covers a subject upon which the Committee on Agriculture has been working for several years.

Federal assistance in carrying out watershed programs is not new. It has been going on for several years as I shall point out shortly. What has been needed, however, is legislation to provide the policies, the framework, and the standards under which action in the field of upstream soil and water conservation and flood prevention can be undertaken jointly by the Federal Government, the States, counties, soil conservation or watershed districts and local citizens groups.

Let me take a moment to point out what authority there has been in the past for Federal aid in watershed programs. The 1936 Flood Control Act as amended and supplemented authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to plan and carry out watershed projects, and under the provisions of that act there were 11 such watershed programs set up. But, that is all that has ever really been accomplished under that act as far as actual projects and construction are concerned. There has been a great deal more done in the way of surveys and reports under that provision, but nothing more has been accomplished in the way of projects. These 11 projects are important, but in the case of most of them, at the rate they have been going, it will be 40 or 50 years before they will be completed. It is the feeling of our committee that this program has failed to accomplish what was expected of it and consequently this bill repeals the authority contained in the 1936 act, with the provision, however,

that the 11 projects now underway shall not be affected in any way by the repeal.

The other legislation I had in mind when I mentioned that there had been previous authority for watershed programs, is contained in the amendment which the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] placed in the Department of Agriculture bill last year providing for the pilot-plant program and appropriating \$5 million to begin construction of these projects. Under this provision a splendid program embracing 62 projects is now underway.

But what has been needed is legislative authority to provide for a permanent program whereby the Federal Government can cooperate with State and local agencies in watershed treatment.

Near the beginning of my remarks I stated that this question had been considered by the House Committee on Agriculture for some time past. One of its subcommittees headed by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] more than 3 years ago began holding hearings and drafting legislation to cover this situation. Hearings were held in Washington, at various points throughout the country, and the committee made a most thorough study of this entire matter.

As a result of the hearings the subcommittee drafted a bill introduced by the chairman [Mr. POAGE]. Hearings were held on that bill in Washington and the bill was reported by the full committee. That was in the 82d Congress. However, the committee was not able to secure a rule for the bill, and it did not come up for consideration in the House during the 82d Congress.

In the present Congress a similar bill was introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and by myself, and by several other Members. It was sent to the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget for a report. As a result of the consideration of that bill by the Department of Agriculture and by the Bureau of the Budget, in consultation with the Army Engineers and the Department of the Interior, the bill now before us was worked out. With some changes of language it is the same bill previously worked out by the committee and introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and myself. The President's message of July 31, 1953, to which I have previously referred, recommended the enactment of the legislation in exactly the form in which it is before us today.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman a moment ago referred to a number of projects that have been surveyed which are now past the survey and planning stage and are actually in the process of being built and concluded.

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. He also referred to the pilot plants which were authorized in the last appropriation bill, last year I believe; and I believe the distinguished gentleman also referred to the appropriation that was made. As I recall, the appropriation last year was around \$7 million

for this project. Does the gentleman recall the figure?

Mr. HOPE. I think that is approximately correct for the projects authorized under the 1936 act as amended. The amount for the pilot plant projects was \$5 million.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that this year there is a reduction of about \$1 or \$2 million from what it was last year.

Mr. HOPE. I am not sure as to the amount that was carried in the budget this year. Seven million dollars, as I recall, is about the amount that has been carried in every recent year.

Mr. FISHER. I just want to point out in connection with what the gentleman has said that down in my own district we have some of these projects in the middle Colorado watershed area, which is one of the 11 authorized in the 1944 Flood Control Act, which are being held up, to some extent, at least, because of a shortage of funds. They have been fully approved by the Soil Conservation Service, but they have run into great difficulty and we are afraid that it will result in some loss, which loss could be averted if they could proceed expeditiously. I am wondering if the gentleman does not agree with me that it would be very wise for the Appropriations Committee—as I know they are doing—to go very carefully into the matter of considering some increases in the appropriation that would enable these projects that are actually set up and have already been approved to proceed, which would be more economical than if they were forced to stop in the middle of their program.

Mr. HOPE. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he is referring to projects that were set up under the 1936 Flood Control Act?

Mr. FISHER. I have in mind one in particular that pertains to an authorization contained in that act. Of course, in addition to that there were the pilot plants or projects that were authorized, all of which are paid out of the same fund.

Mr. HOPE. I can say to the gentleman that I agree with him wholeheartedly and I have appeared in previous years before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Agriculture Department and urged that larger amounts be appropriated for these projects that have been authorized under the 1936 act and upon which construction has been started. I appeared also before the committee on behalf of the pilot plant projects that were carried in the bill last year. My position all the time has been that we will not be able to spend any fund for conservation or for flood prevention where we will get more for our money than we will in projects of this kind.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, everyone here knows the record of the gentleman and that he has always been devoted to the cause of soil conservation in all its forms, but I do think we have a problem now of financing even to the minimum some of the projects already set up and which are in operation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I direct the gentleman's attention to page 3, section 4, paragraph (1), where it is stated:

The Secretary shall require as a condition to providing Federal assistance that local organizations shall—

(1) Furnish without cost to the Federal Government all easements and rights-of-way needed in connection with works of improvement installed with Federal assistance.

Is that common to all public works project bills?

Mr. HOPE. No; it is not. It is in some of them, in one way or another particularly in those relating to floodways and dikes along the main channels of the streams. In the construction of the larger reservoirs I do not think there are such requirements as that. Our committee put that provision in this bill because we want the local communities to bear their part of the cost and their responsibility for these projects.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that would work an undue hardship, or preclude some projects in some cases?

Mr. HOPE. I do not believe so. I know there are a large number of local projects eligible to come in under this program where the sponsors are very anxious and very willing to furnish these easements and rights-of-way. I think that is one of the finest and most commendable things about this program, that is, the interest of the local people in getting together and doing their part in sponsoring and carrying out these programs.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman on that point. I just hope it does not work a hardship on any area or community in the country.

Mr. HOPE. I do not believe it will. I think there is enough interest and enough at stake on the part of the local communities that they will find a way to meet their share of the responsibility. I may say to the gentleman that there is no fixed amount that the local communities have to furnish as far as the total cost of these projects is concerned. In a great many cases I think rights-of-way and easements will be donated.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does this program conflict with the program of the Army engineers as to flood control?

Mr. HOPE. No; because this program deals with soil treatment and the very small dams on the small watersheds at the head of the tributaries. There is no conflict at all between the work that the Army engineers are doing farther downstream and what will be done under this program up here at the head of the watersheds. This program carries out a type of activity that has long been neglected. For many years we have had the soil-conservation program which treated the land itself and we have had the flood-control measures down on the larger streams, but in between there has been a tremendous loss on these small watersheds because we have not applied any plan or program to them whatsoever. This will fill in that missing link.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does this program emphasize the small dams at the headwaters of the tributaries?

Mr. HOPE. It consists entirely of a program for small dams and soil treatment. They are all one project.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. During the consideration of this bill in committee the question of the effect of section 7 on projects heretofore authorized and under construction was brought up and it was said definitely that this would not in any way take away any authorization heretofore given to such projects as the Washita Valley and others. Is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. That is absolutely correct. Section 7 takes care of that matter and states specifically that the authority of the Department to prosecute these projects that have already been started shall not be impaired in any way by this act.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. May I say that I have for years been very much in favor of these projects. Although I am not as close to them as is the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, I have supported him many times in his efforts to build up this big, useful program that is known as the soil-conservation program.

I have been very much interested, and I think the gentleman knows of my interest in a project in Ohio, most of which is in my congressional district. This project is in a very important part of Ohio. It is just south of Columbus, and is known as the Upper Hocking project. This project will serve people who live in a fine agricultural section, and these proposed improvements will tremendously increase the value of many hundreds of acres of fine land. As I remember it, this project has already been approved by the authorities and was included in the bill that was approved last year. I was glad that the gentleman from Kansas brought that out. As I understand it, the bill that we are going to pass today does not in any way infringe on what we did last year; does it?

Mr. HOPE. No; those projects were all begun under the authority contained in the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture last year. This bill would provide for subsequent projects, but it does not in any way conflict with the provisions of the appropriation bill.

Mr. JENKINS. I know that the gentleman knows about this Upper Hocking project.

Mr. HOPE. I am familiar with it, and I know of the great interest that the gentleman has in it, and the splendid work that he has done in securing the approval of that project. I know there is no Member of the House who has shown more interest or given more thought to this type of activity than the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman, but I am still very much interested in that big project, and I am glad to learn from the distinguished gentleman that so far there is no chance of any in-

fringement on that, and that that will in due course come along. As I understand it, construction has already been arranged for and plans are being made to get it under way.

Mr. HOPE. It is being started. The passage of this bill will strengthen all of these other projects which have been started because it will set up a permanent program.

Mr. JENKINS. I am sure that if this project in which I am especially interested in our section is carried out, as it is planned, it will be a great impetus and a great inspiration to this conservation program everywhere because it is bound to be successful and is bound to be an advantage for the people. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is, without any flattery from me, known as the greatest authority in the Congress on many agricultural subjects and especially on soil conservation. Mr. HOPE, I thank you for your assurance.

Mr. HOPE. Yes, that is one of the principal objectives of the pilot plant program.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. As I understand it, this bill will authorize the Department of Agriculture to enter into cooperative working relationships with the States, counties and local groups to do a complete job on upstream watershed treatment and flood prevention, and at the present time this type of authority for cooperative action does not exist. Is that right?

Mr. HOPE. The gentlemen's understanding of the matter is exactly right. This bill sets up a new program, which calls for the cooperation of local communities and the States and the Department of Agriculture. It begins where projects of this kind ought to begin, right at home in the local communities. No one can envisage how large a program this might become because it depends in the end on how much interest there is in the local communities.

Mr. GAVIN. Then the local citizen will take the initiative and provide the leadership? It is intended to strengthen local participation in flood prevention work and resources improvement in their respective communities, is that not correct?

Mr. HOPE. That is exactly right.

Mr. GAVIN. With reference to the sharing of the costs, as I understand it, that will be on a fair and equitable basis between the municipalities and the States and the Federal Government; is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. The bill itself does not set up any formula for the matching of funds. It will depend upon, as the gentleman says, an equitable procedure and the part that will be borne by the Federal Government and the States and the local communities will be based upon the conditions that exist as far as any particular project is concerned. But the committee has had in mind that, overall, it will be about a 50-50 proposition, the Federal Government standing 50 percent of the cost and the States and local communities 50 percent.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], the author of the provision in the appropriation bill last year which made possible the pilot-plant program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] for that acknowledgment. I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that it was due largely to the appearance of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] before our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations last spring that this great program came into being. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] took the time to come over and explain to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations what he had in mind, and I was personally glad to do what I could to help secure the \$5 million with which the program has commenced. Thousands of farmers and other people in my district in Minnesota and all through the Nation are grateful to Mr. HOPE for his help in bringing a real plan of watershed protection and flood control into actual operation. Mr. WHITTEN and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOBAN], and the other gentlemen on our subcommittee joined wholeheartedly with me in bringing out of our committee the first \$5 million for this particular work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The House passed that particular appropriation. It was turned down by the other body. It was then due to the efforts of those on our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture in conference that it was written into the appropriation bill for Agriculture in fiscal 1954. Scarcely any interest was manifested in the other body but they have now come to the realization of how important this program is.

I want to reiterate that it was largely due to the appearance of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] before our subcommittee on that particular day in the spring of 1953 that brought into actuality this hoped for program which Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. POAGE, and I, and others had had for several years, of trying to do something more than the Army engineers have been able to do. Their projects have been so necessarily slow because of their size that we felt it was absolutely necessary for the Congress to put into being a program to initiate small watershed protection projects throughout America to do this great job if we were going to preserve our soil. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of pride to me personally that the Soil Conservation Service has seen fit unofficially to call this program in several States by the designation of the Andersen-Hope watershed protection program. It is my sincere belief that this program will, in the words of the New York Times, "go down into history as one of the lasting and most beneficial legislative actions of the past decade." To me it is the culmination of much hard work and it has been made possible only through

the splendid cooperation of Mr. HOPE and his committee.

Mr. HOPE. I wish to add just this word. I happen to know how diligently Mr. ANDERSEN and the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture worked on this matter last year. They had a lot of opposition, much more than is generally known. They did a grand job, not only in accepting this proposal in the first place and incorporating it into the bill, but in seeing that it was reinstated in the bill in conference after it had been stricken out by another legislative body. The people of this country who are interested in soil conservation, appreciate the splendid work that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] did on that matter.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. On line 3, on the first page of the bill, it says, "That erosion, floodwater, and sediment damages in the watersheds of the rivers and streams of the United States."

In the eastern part of the United States, of course pollution is one of the main causes of trouble, as well as floods. Could there be read into the word "sediment" the pollution problems that affect us on the upper reaches of many of our streams in Pennsylvania, so that we can cooperate on erosion problems and flood control and sediment problems, within the stream, including pollution?

Mr. HOPE. I realize the problem the gentleman is discussing. It is a great problem, but this bill does not attempt to go into that problem. It is one that deals primarily with soil, and small watersheds near the headwaters of the streams, and does not cover as wide a scope as the gentleman is suggesting. But, of course, to the extent that this does prevent floods further down on the streams, to the extent that it holds water back near the place where it falls, it might in some cases contribute to the prevention of pollution as well as floods.

Mr. FULTON. So that pollution is not automatically left out, and can be one of the things which the local people have as a factor in their program.

Mr. HOPE. I see no reason why that could not be considered.

Mr. FULTON. Thank you for enlarging it to that extent.

The other thing is this: In areas that may be termed suburban areas—the town of Carnegie, for instance, is a suburb of Pittsburgh, and Chartiers Creek runs through it. In that particular stream there is quite a lot of sediment that accumulates and holds up the water as well as clogs the stream. Above, there are agricultural lands which are affected.

Would this particular kind of program be broad enough to take in suburban areas, where they are along streams, and where there are agricultural lands behind that would be helped?

Mr. HOPE. I would think that would be a situation where the local people could get together and agree on a program that would fit in perfectly with this legislation at least to the extent that the Secretary of Agriculture is author-

ized to go under the general legislation on soil and water conservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I would merely like to state that in discussing this with various groups interested in conservation they are not only enthusiastic about it but they have one question, namely: Whether there is the technical assistance and skilled people, actual people within the Department now to carry out this program, or whether this will call for additional personnel within the Department.

Mr. HOPE. As of the present time and within the scope of any program that we can foresee for the immediate future, the Department has ample skilled personnel to take care of the program.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The gentleman feels that the personnel at the local level is of sufficient technical skill likewise to take care of the program?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, I do and I might point out that in connection with the reorganization of the Soil Conservation Service special attention is being given to the watershed program.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman and certainly want to congratulate him.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio I may say that I was advised that plans and investigations on each project to determine the scope—preparation of plans for works of improvement and to determine the economic feasibility are to be made in advance of the Department of Agriculture entering into a cooperative agreement with the sponsoring local group; so they would have to develop it, prepare it, and then be in a position to present it and to make justification of it before Agriculture comes into the picture.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would like to direct an inquiry regarding section 7 of the bill. I presume that provision amends section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1936 which was later amended by the act of 1944 to include drainage. I would like to have an expression from the chairman as to whether he is of the opinion that flood prevention in this bill will give authority to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the drainage problem under the designation of flood prevention work.

Mr. HOPE. I can say to the gentleman that I am sure it does not give the Department any authority which it does not already have to deal with drainage matters. I am not sure what power it

has under its general authority to deal with soil and water conservation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I was hoping that it would give that authority, and I hope that the committee if the Department of Agriculture does not seek the authority to carry out drainage projects that it be included in the bill because that is an integral and essential part of flood prevention work.

Mr. HOPE. I would not want to say that where drainage was an incidental part of the project that it might not be included. I think it would have to be an incidental feature to a situation which involved flood control unless the Department of Agriculture already has some authority to deal with the subject.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The report of the Corps of Engineers presently being transmitted to the Committee on Public Works states under the act of 1944 that the flood-control work will be carried out by the Corps of Engineers. The subsequent or drainage work is being deferred to the Department of Agriculture. It would seem to me that to carry out these work projects in an orderly fashion, the authority for a given watershed should be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture; otherwise we disturb the functions of the departments and we find difficulty. I would like to see that authority conferred on the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture if I did not understand him to say that the bill did not contemplate dealing with purely drainage projects but that if in dealing with flood-prevention projects drainage became a vital part of that plan, this authority would be given under the bill to the Secretary to make an agreement which would involve some degree of drainage if that drainage was essential to the development of the flood-prevention project.

Mr. HOPE. I think if drainage was perhaps an incidental matter that was tied in closely with flood prevention and the land treatment phase of the activity that the measure probably would include that authority. However, I do not want to give the impression that was contemplated by the committee as a part of the program because I do not think we considered that phase of the matter in connection with this legislation except as incidental. Certainly there is nothing in this bill which would take away any authority which the Department of Agriculture may now have to deal with drainage problems.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman in what he said, but I do not want the impression left in the Record here or with the Members of the House that if in the development of a proper flood-prevention project it is necessary to do certain things that the Secretary would be prohibited from doing them because merely there was some drainage involved.

Mr. HOPE. I intended in my statement to the gentleman from Alabama to make that clear.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I believe that is the interpretation that should be placed on the bill and I was hopeful of getting an expression from the chairman where any future doubts would be resolved in favor of a drainage program in connection with a flood-control program, because it places too great a burden, otherwise, on the local people to get the Federal funds necessary to go ahead.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments and suggestions.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take the further time of the Committee at this time, but I am submitting as a part of my remarks the following information on this bill in question-and-answer form, as follows:

Question. Is soil conservation the real objective of H. R. 6788 and S. 2549?

Answer. The modern concept of soil conservation includes many things other than soil-erosion control. It includes all measures needed to provide effective use, without deterioration, of soil and water resources for efficient productive agriculture. It involves maintenance of soil fertility, disposal of excess water by drainage, making water available, when needed, by irrigation, and protection of land and crops against damage from flooding and siltation. Prevention of the frequent flooding of small tributary valleys, which often contain the most fertile agricultural land available to farmers and ranchers, is a most important soil-conservation objective. By protecting these bottomlands from frequent flooding and increasing their potential for production, many thousands of acres of wornout or severely eroding upland can be retired from intensive use without disrupting the economic balance of farm and ranch units. Only through such positive flood prevention can the real objective of soil conservation be achieved in many small watersheds. National legislation is not now adequate to provide the kind of assistance needed by local organizations to accomplish their full soil-conservation objective in an integrated manner on the Nation's small watersheds.

Question. Would the proposed legislation establish a big new engineering organization?

Answer. There already exists in the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture a highly competent staff of several hundred engineers who are assisting farmers and ranchers with engineering problems. They work in collaboration with agronomists, foresters, soil scientists, hydrologists, geologists, biologists, range specialists, and many other kinds of technicians to accomplish the presently authorized soil-conservation job. The Forest Service has an engineering organization for similar work on national forests. The proposed legislation merely extends the area over which this Department would be authorized to assist in the solution of agricultural problems, including agricultural flood prevention. The engineering knowledge needed to carry out the purposes of the proposed legislation is of the type required for programs now being carried out cooperatively with local people by the Department of Agriculture. In fact, the Department of Agriculture is the only Federal agency now equipped to successfully carry out, in close cooperation with local people, flood-prevention improvements concurrently with other soil-conservation measures in agricultural watersheds.

Question. Would the proposed legislation duplicate existing authority for watershed protection?

Answer. The proposed legislation would provide for a wholly new type of program, intimately related to the traditional assistance rendered to local people and their organizations by the Department of Agriculture.

It is completely different in principle from the Federal public works type of project which is carried out by other Federal agencies, largely at Federal expense, after authorization by the Congress. Under this proposed legislation, local organizations must apply for assistance before the program is initiated in any watershed, must bear an equitable share of the cost of any works of improvement involving Federal assistance, must contribute all necessary easements and rights-of-way, and must assume responsibility for all operation and maintenance.

Question. Could upstream waterflow-retarding structures and downstream reservoirs become competitive?

Answer. This is a situation that could arise but, in fact, seldom will because of the physical limitations in most watersheds. Upstream waterflow-retarding structures are justified by benefits above the sites where most major downstream reservoirs have been planned. Should a situation of this type arise, the proposed legislation provides in section 6 for the necessary investigations and surveys to achieve coordination.

Question. Would the proposed legislation lead to unbalanced storage systems for large watersheds?

Answer. The proposed legislation is designed primarily to meet small watershed problems when assistance is requested by local organizations. Generally, the small watershed program will not materially affect the design or location of downstream reservoirs. The principal benefits of the small watershed program will be within the confines of the watershed itself with diminishing effects downstream. On the other hand, downstream reservoirs controlling larger areas of more than 250,000 acres will not affect the economic feasibility of the small watershed program. Through this new watershed legislation, upstream agricultural interests for the first time can look forward to assistance in achieving sufficient protection to permit economic utilization of their land resources, without waste and without depriving downstream interests of the protection deemed desirable from the standpoint of the national interest.

Question. Would the proposed legislation split the national flood-control program?

Answer. Since 1936 Congress has recognized in the flood control acts a twofold responsibility: (1) Measures on watersheds for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention; and (2) improvements of rivers and other waterways for flood control and allied purposes. The flood control acts do not distinguish between agricultural and engineering works, but only between measures on watersheds and improvements of rivers and other waterways. Certainly it is recognized by all that measures on watersheds include engineering as well as vegetative measures. Unfortunately, specific responsibilities are not adequately delineated in the flood control acts. As a result, the watershed program vital to agricultural interests has been delayed. New legislation is essential to define the responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture in the watershed field and thereby permit coordination of programs on the basis of understandable terms spelled out by the Congress. Agricultural interests on upstream watersheds are entitled to be served by an agricultural agency equipped and staffed to meet their particular needs in a cooperative program.

The record shows that up to the present time the Corps of Engineers has built or has under construction a total of 165 flood-control and multiple-purpose reservoirs which will have a total storage capacity of approximately 158 million acre-feet. The average size of these reservoirs is therefore approximately 958,000 acre-feet. The Corps of Engineers has built a total of 10 dams that impound less than 7,000 acre-feet of storage, and these 10 special-purpose dams contain just three ten-thousandths of 1 per-

cent of the total storage provided by the Corps of Engineers in all its reservoirs for flood control and other purposes.

On the other hand, the Department of Agriculture has completed or has under construction in the 11 watersheds authorized for flood-prevention programs in 1944, a total of 204 waterflow-retarding structures containing a total storage of approximately 112,000 acre-feet, or an average storage per structure of 556 acre-feet. Only two of these structures exceed 5,000 acre-feet in size. In other words, the average capacity of reservoirs built by the Corps of Engineers to date has been 1,724 times that of the average waterflow-retardation dams built by the Department of Agriculture.

Question. Would the proposed legislation invade the private engineering field?

Answer. There would be no difference in competition with private engineering organizations than now exists in connection with works of improvement installed under authority of the flood-control acts. The Department of Agriculture in its cooperative programs with local people has consistently encouraged the use of local private engineering services when such services are obtainable. There would be no change in this policy.

This is a new program. Local groups will require their own engineers in addition to the Federal technicians. It will clearly mean more, not less, work for private engineers.

Question. Would the proposed legislation short circuit Congress?

Answer. The proposed legislation provides that plans, accompanied by the views and recommendations of the interested Federal agencies, will be transmitted to the Congress through the President before installation of the program is commenced. The Congress would exert the same control over the program as it does over other national programs of the Department of Agriculture. Very important safeguards are the requirements that local organizations apply for assistance before the program is initiated in any watershed, share the cost of any works of improvement involving Federal assistance, contribute all easements and rights-of-way, and assume responsibility for operation and maintenance. In addition, the Congress is kept fully informed during the appropriation process of the progress being made in the installation of works of improvement. These requirements appear to be at least equal to any that are in effect for other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture or of public-works programs administered by other departments.

Question. Would the proposed legislation preclude the Public Works Committees from assuming jurisdiction over an engineering program?

Answer. The program contemplated by the proposed legislation is logically one of primary interest to the Agriculture Committees since it is designed to aid the agricultural interests of the Nation in conserving their basic agricultural land and water resources, and protecting the crops and improvements made possible by their use. It is an agricultural program and not a public-works program. At every step the watershed program will be dependent upon the wishes and desires of local interests who will plan with the cooperation of Federal technical specialists the program they desire, and will decide upon the type of assistance that would benefit them most and at the same time justify Federal expenditures.

Question. Would the proposed legislation promote a piecemeal approach?

Answer. The Nation is already many years behind in the field of resource development, utilization, and conservation in the upstream tributaries as a result of the concentration of effort on the solution of downstream problems. The preponderance of Federal expenditures on downstream works of improvement provides concrete evidence

of the lack of balance between upstream and downstream work. The proposed legislation would provide a means for achieving better balance and would provide for coordination of basic programs where there is positive evidence that such coordination is required. In most instances the downstream works would not be affected or need to be altered because of the protection afforded the upstream agricultural interests.

The facts are that there has been an extremely piecemeal approach to the development of our river-basin resources for flood prevention, flood control, and related purposes. By way of comparison, in round figures, the flood-control improvements completed and placed in operation by the Corps of Engineers to date have cost \$1 billion. The projects which were in the construction stage in 1953 were estimated to cost \$3.4 billion; additional projects in the planning stage were estimated to cost \$3.2 billion; and other flood-control projects authorized, but on which no work had been accomplished, were estimated to cost \$2.5 billion. In other words, the total flood-control program on the major rivers of the Nation to date, including projects completed, under construction, being planned, or authorized represents a total cost of \$9.2 billion. The Chief of Engineers, United States Army, has testified that the total non-Federal contribution to the national flood-control program has been less than 8 percent.

By way of contrast, the total funds made available for upstream flood-prevention improvements in 11 watersheds through this fiscal year have been approximately \$41 million. To this should be added the \$5 million appropriated by the last Congress to start work on a program involving \$29 million of Federal funds in 65 pilot watersheds of the type that would be eligible for assistance under H. R. 6788. Therefore, we believe there is every reason for contention that passage of H. R. 6788 is needed to correct the piecemeal approach that has heretofore existed and thereby to provide a better balance between the control of runoff, water-flow, and sediment from the upper watershed areas and major flood-control improvements on the lower rivers.

Question. Would the proposed legislation open the way for "basin accounts"?

Answer. The Department of Agriculture does not utilize on-site benefits expected to accrue from the application of soil-conservation practices to cover the cost of waterflow-retarding structures that cannot be justified by the benefits they alone produce. Separable elements of watershed programs are justified separately on the basis of benefits attributable to them.

Question. What would be the magnitude of the program under the proposed legislation?

Answer. The magnitude of the program that might be carried out under the proposed legislation is dependent upon annual appropriations, and the ability and desire of local interests to contribute materially to it. The ultimate magnitude of any program for the entire Nation is impossible of prediction at any point in time. The proposed watershed program is readily susceptible to expansion and contraction in line with national economic needs.

Question. Under the proposed legislation, would competent local organizations be required to assume responsibility for operation and maintenance?

Answer. Before any Federal assistance could be provided for installation of works of improvement under the proposed legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to obtain assurances from interested local organizations that satisfactory arrangements had been made to defray all costs of operating and maintaining such works of improvement. Thus, no Federal expenditures would be made for the instal-

lation of works of improvement until interested local organizations had furnished evidence that they were competent to meet their responsibilities for operation and maintenance.

Question. Would there be a policy on cost sharing under the proposed legislation?

Answer. The proposed legislation would require a greater degree of cost sharing by local organizations than is generally required under the Flood Control Acts. The proposed legislation requires, as a minimum, that local organizations provide all necessary easements and rights-of-way, and assume responsibility for defraying all costs of operation and maintenance. It also requires that local organizations bear an equitable share of the cost of installing works of improvement. In the pilot plant program, contributions from local interests will exceed 50 percent of the overall cost.

Question. Should enactment of the proposed legislation await results of demonstration?

A. The benefits from the type of work contemplated under the proposed legislation have been demonstrated piecemeal for 20 years, both by elaborate research and by practical application on the land. The results have convinced the farmers of the Nation and many others that this is the best possible approach to soil and water conservation and watershed protection, including flood prevention. The pilot plant or demonstration program was not designed to delay the enactment of the needed permanent legislation for watershed protection. The agricultural interests of the Nation should not be further delayed in solving their watershed problems which have thus far been given so little consideration by the Federal Government in river basin development.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is no question in my mind but what our subcommittee last spring certainly had in mind the cleaning out of channels and the straightening of waterways so that the drainage areas could have an opening for the waters on their way down to the main streams. In my opinion, surely that is a part of this particular legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. I think that is what the gentleman from Alabama had in mind.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I made inquiry about that particular phase of the matter and they answered by saying:

The question of the size of structures to be built by the Department of Agriculture has been raised. The bill provides for a top limit of 5,000 acre-feet for any reservoir constructed under this authority. This is much smaller than most of the dams built by the Corps of Engineers and larger than most of those built by the Soil Conservation Service.

It also goes on to state:

The bill requires coordination with the Corps of Engineers, section 5, page 5, lines 5 to 14, wherever the plans for a project under the bill would call for the construction of floodwater detention structures.

I merely state that for the information of the Members of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reiterate what the chairman of our great committee has said. This bill is compatible with the message of the President of the United States which came to the Congress on July 31, 1953. Its passage has been recommended by the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, and it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It is almost identical with the bill which was introduced in a former session by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] with whom I worked for the past several years in connection with this very important matter. No Member of Congress has been more interested nor worked more constantly and effectively in behalf of this legislation than my friend the gentleman from Texas, BOB POAGE.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we have had widespread support for this legislation. This bill is not any party issue. It is not the brain child of any one individual or any one party or even any one committee. It is something that the people of the United States have wanted for a long time. It is something that I believe our people need and to which they are entitled. It is something that their Representatives in the Congress have tried to work out for them, and I think that their Representatives have done a very creditable job on both sides of the aisle under the chairmanship of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. It is something to which the Committee on Appropriations had given proper, and I think very sympathetic consideration, particularly under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. It has had the support of former chairmen and of other members of that subcommittee. So, there is no question about whose bill this is.

Mr. Chairman, this is a real bipartisan bill, this is a bill for the people of America. This is a bill to protect the soil and water resources of America, and I believe it will go a long way toward doing so. I hope we do not overemphasize the proposition of how the bill originated or who originated it or anything of that kind, because it is not how we got this bill but what we are going to do under this bill that is important. I believe this bill gives us our first opportunity to have a coordinated general program of upstream flood prevention as distinguished from flood control and to have a much strengthened soil-conservation system.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman from Texas has played an important role in connection with this whole program. He served as chairman of the subcommittee in the last Congress and he made several trips and looked over a vast area of this country studying the problem very carefully. I want to compliment the gentleman for a job well done.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. I have been interested in this subject just as has my friend, and as have many others.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to state that I knew 5 years ago of the interest of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] on this very question. It just happens that we were able last year to commence some of these projects.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate the kind words of the gentleman from Minnesota, because he, too, has been interested in this work. There has been no monopoly of interest in this legislation. But now what will the legislation do for the people? And why are we interested in it? We ought not to be interested in it unless it is going to be helpful to this country. Practically all of us will agree that one of our most serious problems in America is that of keeping water somewhere close to where it falls. When water falls from the sky, that portion which sinks into the ground becomes an unmixed blessing for the people, and I do not care much where it is, whether it is away out in my part of the country where we get rain all too infrequently, or here where it rains more frequently; that portion of the water that sinks into the ground, where it falls, is beneficial.

It not only supplies our crops with the necessary moisture; it feeds our underground sources of water. It maintains our water table. It feeds our springs and wells. It assures the continuous flow of our streams, and if this streamflow comes out from the ground, it keeps those streams clear running streams the year around. Whether you are interested from merely the standpoint of agriculture, whether you are interested from the standpoint of the sportsman, or whether you are interested from the standpoint of industry and the supply of water for the great urban centers, you must be interested in seeing that the water that falls from the skies sinks into the ground and is available for use at future times because, after all, the great earth is the best and the largest reservoir for water that we have ever known.

The water, however, that runs on the surface of the earth may become, and oftentimes does become, a most destructive instrument. It causes your gullies; it causes your siltation; it fills up the reservoirs that you have built to supply cities with municipal water. It causes erosion. It destroys farmlands, crops, and even vast cities. It causes the floods—that water running on the surface of the earth. But I call your attention to the fact that no flood ever originated on the channel of the Mississippi River. Let me repeat that. No flood ever originated on the channel of the Mississippi or any other large stream. No flood ever originated on the channel of any stream. Floods originate in pastures and in fields. Floods originate out where the water falls, not down the streams where the water is running. The water running down the stream is but a manifestation of the flood. The flood originated up on the high ground. It

did not originate down on your river channel.

So, if you are to prevent floods, you must go up where they originate. If you are going to prevent floods you must deal with causes, not simply with results. You can do some controlling of floods by building structures, levees, and reservoirs in the lower areas, but you cannot prevent floods with all of the structures in the world on the lower reaches of big streams. You can only try to control the damage which may be done by a flood which originated far upstream. The only place where you can prevent floods is where the water falls, which is out in the fields and out in the pastures.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to my friend from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has said concerning the benefits that come to the great metropolitan areas under this bill. I do not believe that our people in America appreciate the importance of that feature of the bill. Almost everybody agrees that it is going to help the farmers and is going to help in soil conservation, but was it not developed in the gentleman's committee years ago and more recently before our Committee on Agriculture that there were many of these cities that were dangerously low in water supply and that the conservation of this water is essential to them?

Mr. POAGE. It has been so developed. And every trip that I have taken has emphasized that fact. The investigations that I have made in every community with reference to their sources of water have led me to believe that it is ever increasingly important that we should take action to get water into the soil, because by and large there are only two ways in which our great cities can meet their need for water. One is with well water, ground water which must be recharged from water seeping in, from rainfall; and the other is water that comes from reservoirs, streams, or lakes, which, in turn, must be fed from the flow of surface water. Your great city reservoirs are in constant jeopardy as long as they are subject to flood and siltation. They are all being filled up by siltation at a greater or lesser rate.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to my colleague from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact, the average dam to which the gentleman has just referred has a life expectancy, because of silting, of about 50 years, is not that true?

Mr. POAGE. I think that is about right; and some in the gentleman's country and in mine do not have that much life expectancy.

Mr. FISHER. From what does that silt come?

Mr. POAGE. Of course, that silt comes from the soil of fields and pastures. It comes, of course, from the surface of the soil up somewhere toward the headwaters.

Mr. FISHER. And that is what the gentleman is proposing in this legisla-

tion, to keep it from getting down in and shortening the life of the average dam?

Mr. POAGE. Just as much as possible. We know that to the extent we can prevent that upstream erosion there cannot be downstream siltation.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Is it not a fact that this bill provides that there must be soil-conservation practices preceding the flood-control program we are advocating today so that that silting problem will already have been taken care of? That is the part that the farmer is supposed to contribute as his 50-percent share of this program.

Mr. POAGE. That is certainly a portion of it. This flood-prevention legislation is based on the assumption that the place to start preventing floods is where the water falls rather than at the point to which the water runs. If you are going to stop the downstream floods you have to get out in the fields. The farmers will have to cover their land with a cover crop, those farmers will have to build terraces, and they will have to strip-crop their land.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. IKARD. Is it not a fact, too that these upstream dams make possible the utilization of a lot of bottomland that is now under water at certain seasons of the year, and that is the most fertile, but is largely wasted?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. In our flood-control program we have sought to protect the larger river channels. I certainly am not criticizing that. I am all for our flood-control program. I want to see it continued. But that program does not go to these creek valleys of which the gentleman is speaking. Down my way we speak of creeks. Much of our best land is along our creeks, yet it is flooded to where much of it is useless a great deal of the time and will be for some time to come until we prevent these smaller floods.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe the gentleman realizes that the Washita River is one of the most thoroughly surveyed for this purpose of any river in the country.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. I have seen some of the work on the Washita watershed and it is most outstanding.

Mr. ALBERT. It is estimated that 73 percent of what we call bottomland lies along the creeks rather than along the main stem of the Washita.

Mr. POAGE. Yes. I think that shows it very well. There is about three times as much of this bottomland along the creeks as there is along the big rivers.

On the program of flood control we now have, we have been spending in rough figures about \$600 million a year for some time. Do not hold me to any exact figure; but we have been spending only about \$6 million a year on flood prevention. Those of us who have brought

out this bill feel that this ratio is a little out of balance; not that there is anything wrong in trying to give us flood control, but we have felt that we ought to do something more proportionately toward preventing floods than we are doing.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Does the gentleman agree with me that it is going to be absolutely necessary if this program is to go forward, as obviously the committee, by bringing this bill out, intends that it shall, that more money be appropriated for it?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I think it is. At least, we are going to have to use more than 1 percent of the money we spend on flood control in the prevention of floods. If we will, I don't think we will need quite so much for control.

Now, let me get back to the bill: It is my own thought that this flood-prevention program can best be explained by likening it to our highway program under which our Federal Government has for a great many years contributed to the States and through the States to the localities for the construction of roads and highways. The Federal Government does not carry out a program of highway construction, the Federal Government does not build highways in your community nor mine, but the Federal program of cooperation with the States has given to this Nation the greatest system of highways that any country ever knew. I believe in our highway program. The magnificent vote given to the McGregor bill here in this House just a day or two ago testifies that this House believes in our Federal-aid program for highways.

If it has worked so well in the field of highways, might we not well expect that this is a practical approach to the great program of flood prevention, a program under which the Federal Government will contribute to the localities, assist the localities in carrying out the kind of program they think is necessary for their particular community, under supervision and coordination with a general Federal program, just as we have in our present highway program?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The facts are that a small community can initiate the project now, and interest the State and then the Federal Government rather than waiting, if it is a small flood-control project, until the Federal Government comes in and initiates it, is that not correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right.

Mr. GAVIN. It gives the local community and the State along with the Federal Government an opportunity to participate in paying for the cost of the job.

Mr. POAGE. It does both. It gives to the local community the opportunity to initiate, and it places on the local community a share of the cost. I would think that is proper. I think that we

should let these programs develop locally rather than hand them down from Washington.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. STEED. With reference to what the gentleman was saying, it is true in my district, and I am sure in many other places, the local citizens have already organized themselves into associations to study this problem and to prepare themselves to accept this program, and are now waiting for the passage of this bill.

Mr. POAGE. That is correct; and if we do not pass legislation along this line, there will be nothing that they can do about it. They cannot come here and get an Army engineer-sponsored project. As far as I know, the Army engineers have never built a project that has involved as little as 5,000 acre-feet of detention capacity. As far as I know, the Army engineers have never recommended to this Congress a single project of this kind. So we must have an agency which is directly involved with the program. The Department of Agriculture is that agency, but this bill brings in the Department of Agriculture only at the request of the locality. It does not set the Department up where your local people can only wait for some crumbs to drop. The initiative stays with the local people.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to my friend and former chairman, who has worked on this program so long.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to ask the gentleman if he and I did not actually go to the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives and discuss this entire proposition with the committee?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right. When the gentleman from North Carolina was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture I went with him to call on the then chairman of the Committee on Public Works and did discuss with him the coordination of this program.

Mr. COOLEY. And it is not contemplated that this will in any way interfere with the work of the Army engineers or of the legislative responsibility of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. POAGE. Not in the least. This bill covers a field in which those agencies have never functioned.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There were a series of discussions, and, as far as I know, the differences which were outstanding have been resolved. I do not intend to speak for the Committee on Public Works and can only speak for myself, but we were in accord with the high purpose of this program and hope that it will be prosecuted and carried out effectively.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Alabama. I want to say that he has personally spent much time trying to work out this problem so that everybody would be in

accord on it, and he has given most valuable assistance in working out this program.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I would like to know whether it is the opinion of the gentleman or of the committee that when these small dams or the small dam programs that we are advocating here have been completed, whether it will relieve the tension in the main channels by slowing down the flow of water upstream and holding back the water in the detention dams. Will that not largely prevent, or to a great extent prevent, the floods on the main channels?

Mr. POAGE. It seems to me to be elementary that that is exactly what it will do, because you cannot hold water back where it falls and also have that same water coming down the main stream and flooding some of the cities down below. If you could have held the water on the prairies of Kansas and on the fields and pastures where that water fell—even if you could have made one-half of it sink into the ground during your great flood in 1951, I doubt very much whether you would have had the serious losses which you sustained at Topeka and Kansas City at that time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I commend the gentleman for his unceasing efforts on behalf of this legislation over the last several years. I wish to point out that this should be a great step forward. As the gentleman knows, we have had 11 watersheds and flood-prevention programs authorized for many years, we have had a problem trying to get funds through the Congress to prosecute those works. Our subcommittee did provide \$5 million last year for pilot plants to test the value of this type of project throughout the United States. Apparently, everybody seems to be interested in that very much. We have \$5 million in the budget this year to expand those pilot plants.

I would like to point out that this year's budget provides less money for the 11 watersheds where the work is going on, than the amount that they were able to use last year. So I do hope that we can get funds to prosecute the works in the watersheds where the plans are underway, because that is the best way to further demonstrate the value of this type of structure, through the pilot plants, and then by completing the projects in these 11 watersheds.

I appreciate the gentleman giving me this time to say these things, and I know that he has contributed as much as anyone in the Congress toward working out this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Favorable action, no doubt, has been taken by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of

the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget on this legislation?

Mr. POAGE. In the report you will find the recommendation from the Secretary of Agriculture. You will also find the report recommending the passage of this bill by the Bureau of the Budget, and the report says that they speak for the other departments.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Fear was expressed a few moments ago that these proposed projects would constitute a financial burden on the local communities. I think it should be clearly pointed out that none of these projects will be inaugurated unless it is with the consent of the people in the local communities; unless it is with such consent of the people in the local communities, nothing will be forced upon them whatsoever.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. HOEVEN. They will have to be initiated at the grassroots. So if they are fearful about financial responsibility, they do not have to go into the undertaking?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. LOVRE. I want to commend the gentleman for the yeoman service he has performed on this legislation. I was a member of the subcommittee. In 1951 we made a few trips inspecting these various projects. Not at any time have I heard any opposition to this type of legislation. As a matter of fact, I have never seen such complete unanimity of favorable opinion on any legislation as I have on this type of legislation.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman. He, too, has been most active in bringing this measure to its present favorable legislative position. He was a most valuable member of the subcommittee.

Getting back to the details of the bill, we have long been faced with the question of how we were going to do this kind of watershed work. Everybody is agreed it should be done. So we have brought in this bill which authorizes these steps: It allows any community in the United States, through a new or existing organization, whether a city, county, watershed district, soil-conservation district, or any local government agency so authorized by State law to ask the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect their problem and see if a plan can be worked out that will be mutually agreeable to the locality and the Secretary. The Secretary is empowered to make those investigations. If they are favorable, he then goes a little further and must determine the ratio of the benefits to the estimated cost, and only in the event that the ratio of benefits to estimated cost appears to be favorable, can he go further and recommend that the Federal Government cooperate with the locality by paying part of the cost. This is to prevent a community that might feel there was great need for some structure, but where there was not as much benefit to be derived as there was cost

involved, from spending money that would not be an economical expenditure. Then after the Secretary has found that it is a good economic investment, the bill authorizes him to so report to the President and then to the Congress. The bill requires local contributions, but it makes possible construction which many localities could never make without Federal help.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it is a source of considerable satisfaction to me that this legislation is going to be enacted into law in this session of Congress. I wholeheartedly support this legislation. It meets a need in our conservation work that has been felt for a long time.

The pattern it follows is sound. The very fact that local communities must initiate it and must pay part of the cost makes it a sound and economical program and one that will be geared to the actual needs as they exist, and it will not lead to empire building on the part of any Federal agency.

I want to pay my respects and compliments to the Committee on Agriculture, the various individuals who have worked on this legislation, to the Appropriations Subcommittee, and the Subcommittee on Agriculture for what they have done here. But I believe also we should say something about the people back home who have promoted this legislation and have made it possible.

Something over a year ago it was my privilege to arrange an appointment at the White House with President Eisenhower when some 50 or 60 conservation leaders over the United States came to Washington and presented to President Eisenhower the picture about this problem and the need for a program such as this. Those conservationists from all parts of the country spent several days here. They met with a group of men from this body, held a meeting over in the Agricultural committee room. They had another meeting with certain Members of the other body, and they followed up with several trips to Washington and got the wheels rolling so that today we have these efforts that you gentlemen here have put forth so long coming to fruition because we have the administrative backing of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Department of Agriculture for this bill.

The individual who promoted this meeting, who brought these conservation-minded leaders to Washington, happens to be a gentleman from my district. I refer to Mr. Raymond McConnell, Jr., the editor of the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal. Mr. McConnell has given months and years of unselfish service in this cause. He is one of the cochairmen of the Salt Creek-Wahoo Water Conservation Commission. He formulated this program, he contacted these people over the country, brought them here, and had a great part in selling this idea to President Eisenhower and to the various executive agencies.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, chairman of the committee.

Mr. HOPE. I simply want to take this time to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman has made concerning Mr. Raymond McConnell and the part he has played in the development of this program.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman very much.

I want to pay my tribute also to the Members of the House here who for years have advocated a program that meets this particular area of the problem. With the help of these outside leaders in the conservation movement we are at last able to formulate a national program which is a new and significant step in conserving our national resources. The ownership, possession, and use of this good earth is a sacred trust, and we owe it to our children and our grandchildren down through the ages to leave this good earth just a little richer and a little more productive than it was when we came on the scene.

This bill is a splendid achievement.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the enactment of H. R. 6788 will be a long step in the direction of conserving the soil and water resources of our country. Briefly the bill provides for a program of cooperative action between the Federal Government and soil conservation districts and other State and local agencies in attacking the problems of upstream flood prevention and water conservation.

Heretofore, the Congress has set up a program of the kind now under consideration in 11 watersheds. In addition to that, certain pilot projects have been authorized. Except in these areas, there has been a huge gap in our soil conservation and water control programs. For a long time the Army engineers have been grappling with the problem of controlling major floods on the main stems of the great rivers of this country. In addition to this, in more recent years the Soil Conservation Service cooperating with soil conservation districts has instituted a program of conservation on individual farms. This program, supplemented by the so-called ACP funds, has gone a long way toward encouraging farmers to adopt scientific soil conservation practices on their land. Under this program, tens of thousands of farm ponds have been built; terraces have been constructed; proper land use has been applied; and rotation practices have been instituted. These things have caused a veritable revolution in American agriculture. Yet, with all the gains that have been made, a big area in the conservation field has been left almost untouched. This is in the area of upstream flood prevention.

One of the major segments in a coordinated flood control and soil conservation program is in the area between the farm pond and the huge downstream reservoir. We have trapped millions of tons of water in farm ponds and in

seeded pastures on the one hand and huge reservoirs on the other. We have learned, however, that in spite of all this, floods have a way of developing in the creeks and tributaries of our larger streams. This is not the kind of job that the Corps of Engineers has been tackling, and it is a job too big for individual farmers or even individual soil conservation districts. The flood prevention program of the Soil Conservation Service has supplied the answer. This program, instituted in 11 watersheds a few years ago, has gone far enough now to make it crystal clear that it ought to be extended to every watershed in the United States.

This program is in demand everywhere. Citizens from all sections of our country have petitioned our committee to give them the benefits of this fine program. Only a few days ago I received a letter from my district advising that a new watershed association, known as the Poteau River Watershed Council of Soil Conservation Districts, had been formed. It was organized for the specific purpose of working out an upstream flood-control program in an area where such a program could veritably work wonders. Heretofore, I have heard from representatives of Blue Valley Flood Control, Inc., an organization of farmers ready to push a program of upstream flood prevention in the Blue River watershed. Expressions of interest in this program have also been received from residents of the Kiamichi, Boggy and Little River areas in my district. The enactment of this bill followed by adequate appropriations would make it possible for such groups as these to forge ahead immediately with an effective program of watershed conservation.

The people of my district, and for that matter the overwhelming majority of the people of my State, in my judgment, support the principle of this bill. They believe that it is better to prevent floods than to control them. They believe that it is better to stop the water where it falls than to catch it after it has reached destructive proportions. They believe that wherever possible it is better to save fertile lands than to submerge them.

For some unexplained reason, in recent months upstream rivershed conservation has come under attack from certain exponents of large dams. There seems to be a feeling on the part of some that those who want upstream flood prevention are violently opposed to downstream flood control. This is not true. The thousands of my constituents who have advocated the principle involved in this bill favor controlling floods wherever and however necessary. They do feel, however, and I think rightly so, that as much of the job as possible should be done in the upper reaches of our watersheds and that large dams should not be built covering up thousands of acres of fertile valley lands and driving people from their homes, unless it is absolutely necessary and unless proper upstream flood prevention will not do the job alone. We believe that the creeks should be controlled first and huge expensive, downstream river structures built later if needed. We are convinced that if proper

upstream practices are instituted many of the huge, costly reservoirs now contemplated on the main stems of our large rivers will be unnecessary.

In Oklahoma our people are particularly alert to the advantages of this type of program. This is because we have in our State a going project in the Washita Valley which was one of the 11 projects originally authorized. While the construction program on this watershed, except for a few creek watersheds, is only getting started, enough work has already been done to convince our people that it is basically sound. No watershed in the country is so well organized or so thoroughly charted as to the potential benefits of upstream flood prevention. I think it would be helpful to the House if, by way of illustration, I read into the record at this point an analysis of this project and its problems which has been prepared and condensed into a few paragraphs by the Washita Valley Flood Control Council. I quote from the council's brochure on the Washita Valley flood prevention program:

What is the Washita Valley project?

A plan to stop water where it falls, storing surplus water and releasing it slowly. This prevents excess runoff and floods, that take the soil away—32 million tons a year now. It steps:

1. Land treatment, a fundamental program to use every acre of land wisely and in accordance with its capability.

2. A network of small detention dams built on waste lands upstream from the fertile creek bottomlands to prevent start of floods on the 64 creeks. Every creek along the 5,085,040-acre Washita will have flood protection, upstream.

The Washita Valley program is a flood prevention program, an agricultural recovery and improvement plan. It is not like other flood control programs where control is attempted by large and expensive dams far down on the main stem of rivers.

• • • Flood prevention by land treatment and upstream detention dams is far more economical, practical and safer than controlling floods after large volumes of water have been allowed to ravish the land and endanger lives.

The benefit of the Washita Valley program is 2½ times the cost.

Forty percent of the land treatment phase is completed. This part of the program will reduce flood damages 2 to 5 percent during major storms and 10 percent during minor storms. • • •

Stopping water where it falls lets rainfall seep into the ground, enriching crops, reviving springs with clear water.

At present, the Washita Valley floods are endangering numerous municipal water systems. Sedimentation is depleting capacity of reservoir storage.

Silt won't flow when water is stopped where it falls. Water won't run off and cause floods when silt is stopped. Soil conservation practices accomplish this result.

Without help soon in preventing floods, the flood plain will continue to widen. Floods will be worse each year. We must get action before it is too late—save, improve the soil in Oklahoma's breadbasket, in our time.

Large or small, our river watersheds are dying. The cause: erosion on the slopes, floods and sedimentation on the bottoms. People of the Washita Valley are determined to do something about it—through the soil conservation district program of (1) land treatment, and (2) flood control by use of small detention dams as planned and engineered by the Soil Conservation Service. Every creek will be protected from floods;

farmers and ranchers will be aided in properly using their lands for production of crops and livestock and maintaining and improving the productivity of the soil.

We can, and must, get this program speeded up to be completed in 7 years. We cannot wait 75 years.

Floods produce damages which may eventually wreck the economy of Oklahoma. At present, about 2 million acres in the watershed show slightly accelerated erosion, mostly in the flood plain and better range lands. Another 2 million acres are moderately eroded, and more than 1 million acres are severely eroded. More than 70 percent of the flood damage occurs along the tributaries of the Washita—so creek-by-creek treatment is needed badly, now.

The present rate of soil loss each year is estimated to be about 32 million tons of soil, an average of 6.20 tons an acre, or 17,275 acre-feet. This soil must be saved.

The Washita Valley soil conservation plan of land treatment and flood control by use of small detention dams will bring \$5 million a year saved from flood damages, and another \$10 million to landowners and operators as a result of conservation measures in farming and ranching.

Floods, occurring along the tributaries 6 to 9 times a year increase their wrath on the Washita annually, and damage more and more the valuable 265,000 acres of rich bottomlands on the creeks. The main stem never floods all at once, but has 102,000 additional acres of bottomland. Therefore, individual treatment of each stream is necessary.

Unlike big dams which cover rich bottomland and fail to protect upstream soil, the detention reservoirs of the Washita Valley program do not cover up good land. They are not silt traps. They help prevent floods. They actually store more water than big dams and at about half the cost.

This statement from which I have been quoting points up the only thing wrong with the Washita program, and that is that it has moved too slowly. Louis P. Merrill, former regional director of the Soil Conservation Service for the southwest region, testified before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture a few years ago at Gatesville, Tex., that at the present rate of development it would take 75 years to complete the Washita project. This is ridiculous. It is likewise ridiculous that less than 2 percent of the flood-control dollar should be spent for flood prevention while more than 98 percent is spent for downstream flood control. It is our hope that the passage of this bill will reverse this trend. We hope this bill will point the way ultimately to a philosophy which will dictate that we shall spend at least 50 percent of the flood-control dollar on the tributary watersheds of this country where more than half of the good bottomland of this country is found. The passage of this bill will enable this program to reach every watershed in the United States. This is important. Heretofore only 11 watersheds have been approved for funds under this program. These 11 watersheds represent 2.2 percent of all the watershed acreage in the United States. This job should not be limited to specific watersheds. It should open up opportunities to people in every section of the country to begin immediately a program of watershed development and flood prevention. I for one want to see this program applied in every watershed in my own congressional district.

I want to see the money spent for this rather than for the construction of huge reservoirs such as that proposed at Millwood, Ark., which would back water into my district and destroy the economic background of several Oklahoma communities. With the money contemplated for projects of this kind, untold quantities of flood prevention and water conservation could be had in my State and congressional district.

It is useless to build huge watersheds without a program of flood prevention designed to prevent siltation. The siltation in Lake Texoma is ample evidence of the need for the speedy completion of the Washita project.

Siltation is a problem which confronts practically every municipality in the country. Many of us have seen the spectacle of city reservoirs, full of mud rather than of water. This is a problem which has become acute in many Oklahoma communities. That is why this program has captured the imagination of people living in the cities and towns of my State, as well as those in the rural communities.

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of H. R. 6788 means a new era in the field of flood control in this country. It means that within a short time practically every community will become flood-prevention minded. It means that Members of the Congress from all sections of the country hereafter will receive demands for the expansion of this program. It means that a substantial portion of the enormous funds heretofore appropriated for large downstream reservoirs which have literally driven families from their homes and covered up their fields will be diverted to a system of flood prevention that will react to the benefit of all.

Under authority heretofore obtained in the House and to typify the demand for this type of program, I insert the following resolutions and statements:

Whereas technical and other assistance is provided farmers and ranchers by the Soil Conservation Service under the Federal Flood Control Acts to plan and apply a conservation land treatment program and structures for sediment control and waterflow retardation; and

Whereas such work as being applied on the Washita River watershed of Oklahoma and others throughout the Nation has proved the worth of this program: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts, in its annual meeting in Oklahoma City, January 12, 1953, go on record favoring an expansion of this type of flood prevention and urge the Congress of the United States to provide that 25 percent of all funds appropriated for flood control be used in the Agriculture Department's upstream flood-prevention program; be it further

*Resolved*, That we urge the Congress to give early authorizations and provide appropriations for all watersheds where survey reports have been submitted by the Soil Conservation Service, and to modify legislation, if needed, in order that this type of program can be started on small watersheds throughout the Nation.

Then another, this time from a banker:

FOR THE ATTENTION OF FARMERS AND  
BUSINESSMEN

Because we know that you are interested in the Washita Valley flood prevention pro-

gram, we are enclosing herewith a brochure together with a petition, Appeal to Congress and the President. If you have not already done so and believe in this program will you kindly sign the petition and have 10 of your neighbors sign with you and mail the same in the enclosed envelope to the Washita Valley Flood Control Council, Post Office Box 541, Pauls Valley, Okla.

The Congress is not being asked to appropriate more money for this purpose but is being urged to route more of the money already appropriated to this worthwhile program.

Many of our citizens are manifesting their interest in this vital movement and this request will help to speed up action in Washington. We, as bankers, strongly believe that the erection of detention reservoirs along the Washita Valley and all its tributaries, as recommended by the Soil Conservation Service, will not only help in preventing the disastrous floods we have had in the past but will also save the soil. Our bank sends this to you in the public interest. Your help is needed.

Yours sincerely,

E. M. ALLEN, President,  
The First National Bank, Chickasha, Okla.

#### APPEAL TO CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

As citizens of the Washita Valley in Oklahoma, we urge completion of the agricultural flood control program of the Soil Conservation Service.

The constant, needless flooding is disastrous to the soil and can be stopped if this project along the 5,095,040-acre Washita is completed in 7 years. At the present rate of funds it will take 75 years. That will be far too late.

This can be accomplished by immediate authorization and appropriation of more funds for agricultural flood control, and allotment of more of the flood control dollar for this needed project.

We deplore the inequity of spending only 1 cent of each flood control dollar for agricultural flood control, while 99 cents goes for big dams, rivers, levees, harbors, etc. Each year's delay in allotting more of the flood control dollar—3 or 4 cents—to basic use increases the loss to Oklahoma and the Nation.

Seventy-two percent of flood damage takes place in the 64 creek watersheds of the Washita—only a small amount along the river's main course. Thus this grassroots solution of land treatment and a system of small detention reservoirs, to stop water where it falls, is the answer. The small detention dams will use only invaluable land, not fertile bottomlands.

We commend the Congress for its wisdom in starting this urgently needed, horseshoe approach to flood prevention and control. We hope it will not be neglected by allotting a comparative nothing this year, or in the immediate future.

Our soil must be protected and improved now. In 75 years or 50, or 25, it will be too late.

Typical of the newspaper support for this type are the following excerpts from editorials in Oklahoma newspapers:

The Poteau News, Poteau, Okla., January 28, 1954:

"Time has proven that United States Senator MIKE MONROEY was right years ago when he advocated upstream flood control, contending that big dams were not the solution to the flood problem. It wasn't a popular stand to take back when all the politicians were advocating big dams, much to the delight of chambers of commerce and recreation enthusiasts throughout the country.

"MONROEY has never been opposed to big dams. It's just that he has always felt they should be built last of all instead of first of all. In other words, he has maintained—

and now it has been proven true—that it would take more than big dams to solve the flood control problem."

Again, the Daily Oklahoman, Oklahoma City, Okla., Sunday, January 24, 1954, speaking editorially of this program said:

It would save soil instead of submerging it. It would prevent floods instead of checking them after they have formed. It would keep land in production perpetually instead of taking fertile land out of production permanently. Naturally, it is impossible to build a big dam in any alluvial valley without destroying many thousands of the most fertile acres in the State.

The little-dam advocates lack the support of an element that is rendering constant aid to the promotion of the big-dam program.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma for his fine statement and to associate myself with it. We have similar projects in my own second district of Oklahoma and I know how much it means to the people and to the future of that area that this program be carried forward. I feel that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] has played a great role in bringing this program to fruition as is being done by this bill.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank my colleague who has always shown an interest in this fine work.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I want to compliment the gentlemen from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT and Mr. BELCHER] members of the committee, for the splendid work they have done on behalf of this measure.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I am the only opponent of this measure, I will announce at the beginning that I will yield to no one.

Mr. Chairman, I rise—not to oppose soil conservation, because I do not oppose it—but to announce that I do oppose multiplication of Federal agencies functioning in the field of water resource control, use, and development. I rise to find out if that is what we are doing here.

As of today—as all Members know—there are presently two agencies of the Federal Government charged with the responsibility of utilization and control of our water resources: The Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

No Member is unaware of the difficulties of attempted cooperation, the friction, the differences of opinion in technical matters and as to areas of jurisdiction, the long-standing and still unresolved opposing views with regard to methods of cost allocation—that have arisen because of the fact that these two great Federal agencies both function in the field of water control and water resource development.

The Hoover Commission—and every other commission or other study group which has ever looked into the matter—has recommended that reorganization be effected which would consolidate responsibility for these functions in one Federal agency.

So, what are we doing here?

Are we creating a third major Federal water development and control agency?

Neither the bill before us, nor its committee report supply the answer.

I look in vain in the committee's report accompanying H. R. 6788 for the comments of the Department of Defense—and its Corps of Engineers; I look in vain in the committee's report for the comments of the Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Reclamation.

It will be noted at page 4 of the committee report, in referring to H. R. 4877, this bill's predecessor, the Agriculture Committee advises us:

None of the witnesses at these hearings expressed opposition to the bill or its principles.

But, question: Were witnesses from the Departments of Defense and Interior invited to express their views for the House committee?

Apparently not, or we would perhaps find their official Department reports included in the committee report accompanying H. R. 6788.

We do have two agencies now in the field of water utilization, development, and control.

Does H. R. 6788 create a third such agency?

The Committee on Agriculture report on the House bill indicates that it does not.

Some people think it does. A couple of people who think so are the Secretary of the Army, and General Sturgis, Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Let me quote from comments on the Senate companion bill to the bill now before this body:

First, from General Sturgis, Chief of Engineers, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on S. 2549, identical to H. R. 6788.

First:

The bill \* \* \* contains provisions which are not in the public interest and will inevitably lead to duplication and confusion in Federal activities, specifically in flood control, and which will make more difficult the already complex problem of coordinated water-resource development.

Second:

The bill actually would provide legislative authority to plan and build engineering works far in excess of any works required for conserving the soil and increasing its productivity. In fact, this is the only type of work that would be authorized by this bill which the Secretary of Agriculture does not already have full and clear authority to undertake.

Third:

The bill contemplates construction by the Federal Government of a large program of reservoirs for flood control in small upstream valleys, rather than Federal assistance in an agricultural program. \* \* \* The Department of Agriculture and Bureau of letters supporting it do not indicate the magnitude of the Federal program that could be under-

taken \* \* \* the engineering and construction phase of the program \* \* \* would aggregate many billions of dollars.

Fourth. This plan "would inevitably lead to another and very large engineering agency in the Federal executive branch. This would run counter to increasingly insistent demands by the public, the Congress, and by bodies such as the Hoover Commission, for elimination of duplication and overlap in the executive branch."

Fifth. Some other comments: "Obvious duplication," "in direct conflict" with accepted principles of coordination "bill would set a new pattern under which the legislative committees would relinquish control they now exercise."

Sixth. From the Secretary of the Army in a letter dated February 12, 1954, to chairman of Senate Committee on Agriculture on Senate bill 2549, identical to House bill 6788:

Bill \* \* \* deserves further scrutiny as to its relationship to the public interest and to Federal and administration policy in water-resource development.

\* \* \* lay the basis for a large new Federal engineering and construction program \* \* \* would promote competition and duplication of work between Federal agencies.

I feel that the bill should establish a much smaller limiting size, which would be in consonance with the criterion of local accomplishment; and that the bill should specify definitely that the works authorized should not be constructed by the Federal Government.

Now, those are some of the comments from the Department of Defense.

H. R. 6788's title carries the language "for soil conservation, and for other purposes." I think we should know what those other purposes are—and Army's position is clear. It is my understanding that the Department of the Interior shares this concern with the Corps of Engineers. I think it should be a matter of concern to this Congress, and for now will reduce it to this: We now have two major Federal water development agencies.

H. R. 6788 apparently would establish a third such agency.

If we assume this is desirable, then in the interest of consistency, and so that Congress may discharge its responsibility for safeguarding the taxpayers' dollar, the taxpayers' interest in this matter, is it asking too much to incorporate the same Federal safeguards, the same requirements for congressional authorization, the same reporting requirements now required of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in this legislation?

Only last month this body unanimously approved a bill—H. R. 4551—reported by our Interior Committee, which took away the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to authorize anything but minor projects without the prior approval of plans by the Congress.

Congressional authorization? Not in 6788.

Flood control and reclamation law requires compliance with certain rigid engineering and economic feasibility standards. Not so in 6788.

Flood control and reclamation law requires—not suggests, but requires—that

all other Federal agencies have a 90-day period in which to comment on any plans proposed to be effected by the Department of Interior or Army. Not so 6788.

Flood control and reclamation law requires—makes mandatory, not discretionary, or a matter of secretarial judgment—submission to the affected State or States of any plans for comment. Not so 6788.

Laws governing reclamation and flood-control activities spell out carefully conditions under which repayment of Federal dollars must be made—who, when, how much, and the basis for such repayment. Not so 6788.

Section 4, subparagraph (2) of 6788, beneficiaries would be required to assume such repayment "as may be determined by the Secretary to be equitable in consideration of anticipation"—that apparently should be anticipated in the printed bill—"benefits for such improvements."

I will not labor the point further, but it clearly is this:

Let us either amend this bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the same standards and requirements as are demanded of Army and Interior in water-resource development or let us amend the 1902 reclamation law as it has been brought up to date, and the flood-control laws now on the books, to embody the same standards and requirements—if they may be called such—as are set out in H. R. 6788.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the date of the communication from the Defense Department that the gentleman read?

Mr. SAYLOR. February 12, 1954.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not rather strange that if the Defense Department was interested enough in this particular legislation to write that communication it would not have indicated to the chairman of our committee a desire to appear in opposition to this bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. They did appear in opposition to a similar bill before the Senate.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt but that our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just preceded me, is very earnest about the views he has expressed. However, I think it should be pointed out and emphasis should be laid upon the fact that, as I am informed, they are not actually his views but are those of the Army engineers. He stated that they were contained in a message from the Department of Defense, but of course they actually came from the War Department engineers, who we are told oppose this legislation.

In the opening of his remarks the gentleman from Pennsylvania also stated that he had searched in vain through the report for recommendations from various departments of the Government. He is correct in saying there is nothing in the report from the

various agencies to which he referred. However, in all deference to the heads of these agencies, they are simply the subordinates and actually the employees of the Chief Executive of the United States. The President certainly does not have to call upon and secure from his subordinates a favorable report before he asks for legislation. Nor must the Congress have such in order to pass it. Why should these agency heads be heard to complain, if they have any complaint? The President himself sought this legislation. I do not always agree with the President, but in this instance I certainly do. Furthermore I do not feel that the views of the agencies mentioned by my friend are of material consequence. Whatever they are, there is no good reason why they should be included in the report.

Reference was also made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that there was nothing in the record or report from Mr. Dodge of the Bureau of the Budget. I think that is what he said. I do not want to misquote him. May I call attention to the fact that there is a statement in the report from Mr. Rowland Hughes, the Acting Director of the Budget Bureau. This was sent down to us on August 31, 1953, exactly 31 days following the message of the President of the United States requesting this legislation. Both communications are found on pages 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the report. In the very last paragraph of the letter from Mr. Hughes I find these words:

In our judgment the purposes of H. R. 6788 would be consistent with the view of the President that "we should move ahead in the construction of works of improvement and the installation of land-treatment measures as rapidly as possible consistent with a sound overall fiscal program."

The Acting Director of the Budget, Mr. Hughes, says that the bill now before us is in keeping with what the Chief Executive has requested.

This bill does not create any new agency. It simply expands a type of work which has been carried in a very limited fashion and under other authority for a very long time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. The Department of Agriculture has the responsibility for most of our major watersheds. This is a watershed improvement and protection and water detention bill. With the forest fires right now in Colorado, in the Colorado watershed we need these upstream detention basins.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman. The facts are that this bill permits the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture in the administration of these programs to just put more of them into operation and to expand this most beneficial and highly desirable work to all sections and regions of the United States which are in dire need of it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. Is it not true that the jurisdiction so far as this bill is concerned

is completely within the Department of Agriculture, and that the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of the Army engineers have absolutely nothing to do with it?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course, the gentleman is correct. If I had to wait on the Bureau of Reclamation, and it renders a good service in its field of operation, or if I had to wait on the Army engineers, and they render a good service, too, for the type of program which this bill authorizes, then my people would never live to see the day when we would get what we need in the way of water control and water conservation. In their own spheres of operation they render good service and do a good job but we also need the type of service this bill would make available, something which the Army engineers and other agencies do not now provide.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot come before this committee in the same capacity that most of you gentlemen come and pass compliments back and forth and maybe be worthy of some compliments myself, but I am very happy to learn that the issues involved here are perhaps the least controversial of any that have come before the House of Representatives since I became a Member of this body. I am delighted to find the Members, generally speaking, or at least a part of them, from the old rock-ribbed State of Pennsylvania see the light and are in favor of this bill. I speak to them in particular because I, myself, came from Pennsylvania having left it after my father and grandfathers and those before them had witnessed the washing off of most of the good soil that covered that State when the white man first settled it.

I have been intrigued by the little opposition we have had here and by the argument that has been advanced that we are encroaching on a domain that is already occupied; that we already have in the Government an organization that should take care of this. I question the accuracy of that statement. The fact of the matter is that this situation has always existed and that absolutely nothing has been done in this field we are talking about now. In other words, we are coming to a completely unoccupied field. You know what happens when a military force, or any other finds an unoccupied field. It is open to the first one to move in. That is what the Department of Agriculture is doing.

I would like in the short time that I have to draw a picture of the conditions that have led up to this bill. As I said, I came into Kansas from Pennsylvania, when the country was new. At that time the soil was 8 or 10 or 12 inches deep. At present you can go out in the very best parts of that State, where we have 30 or 40 inches of rainfall ordinarily, and you will find that almost half of that soil is already gone. You will find many farms with acres and acres that are brown and yellow and absolutely worthless. It would be a better farm if you could close the gap and the farm would

bring more money, because there is not enough fertility to pay to cultivate it. That is an unfortunate situation that has been brought about because we have not done anything in the way of soil conservation or flood prevention.

I am not blaming anybody. I was a farmer. I could not do it. My father could not do it. We did not have the time and we did not have the machinery. We knew what to do but we could not do it. But in recent years we have built machinery for terracing and for building dams, and we are using it. It is only a matter of not having enough money to go ahead with the work. Many of our farmers have done flood-control work on our farms, and we have slowed down this rainfall on our land; we have constructed terraces, waterways, and farm ponds. We have taken all possible measures to conserve our soil and utilize the rainfall. That is as far as we can go. We have no authority to go any further. Neither do we have the means, nor is it our responsibility. That is where this bill provides for the Agriculture Department to take over, in that twilight zone that has never been occupied.

Members of the committee, I had the honor—and I consider it an honor—to have been asked by my fellow farmers in Brown County to call a meeting to organize an association to develop a watershed; just what we are talking about here today.

More than 150 interested landowners and operators met in the high-school auditorium of Hamlin, Kans., and, after listening to a talk by the farm editor of the Nebraska State Journal, in which he set forth the very successful program that had been adopted by the farmers in the Salt Creek and Wahoo area near Lincoln, Nebr., it was unanimously decided to organize a Walnut Creek Watershed Association. I had the honor of being elected president of that association.

This association contemplates putting into practice exactly the kind of program that is being provided for by the terms of this bill. It is the kind of program that the agricultural people of the Midwest are trying to promote at this time, and which the passage of this bill will greatly expedite and encourage. By the terms of this bill, the Agriculture Department, with its trained technicians, will be moving into an area that has heretofore been neglected, undeveloped, and unoccupied. By this program the surplus rainfall which has been slowed down on pasture and farmland will be further slowed down in the detention dams provided for by the terms of this bill. By this program not only will loss of soil be held at a minimum on the farmland, but flooding of the lowlands of the creek valleys will be generally prevented and in every case greatly minimized. The slowing down of the runoff on the fields, in the ravines, and the creeks will result in greater absorption of water into the soil, thereby raising the water table throughout the area, stabilizing the flow of springs, and increasing the underground water supply of the entire area. This is a factor seldom mentioned and generally overlooked, but of great importance.

The completion of this program in any given area will therefore have the following beneficial results: Curtailment or elimination of soil erosion, minimizing of flood damage, greater reserve of moisture for growing of crops, stabilization of the underground supply of wells and springs, and in addition to these beneficial results, that of prevention of flood damage on the larger streams and river channels below. Without going into the merits of a program of flood control on river channels by means of big dams, it can be safely said that there is no way of knowing what may be needed on the river channels until the necessary measures of soil conservation and flood prevention have been taken in the upland areas.

This is the program which the President envisaged in his message to Congress and which Congress will implement in the passage of this bill. I shall support the measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor this legislation and I favor its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge favorable consideration by the House of H. R. 6788, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States in setting up soil-conservation and watershed programs.

Flood prevention by land treatment and upstream detention dams is far more economical, practical, and safer than controlling floods downstream with big dams after large volumes of water have been allowed to accumulate, ravage the land, and endanger lives.

The Washita Valley flood-control program in the State of Oklahoma represents a tremendously practical application of the theories and purposes contained in the plans outlined in H. R. 6788. Simply stated, the purpose of such legislation is to stop water where it falls, to store surplus water and to release it slowly. Before efforts were coordinated in the Washita River Valley in southern Oklahoma to conserve water and soil, it was estimated that 32 million tons of earth washed downstream annually—an average of 6.29 tons an acre. No State or nation can permit this blind waste of the world's greatest natural resource—its soil.

By treating land in such a manner so as to use every acre wisely and in accordance with its capability and by constructing a network of small detention dams built on wasteland and upstream from the fertile creek bottomlands to prevent the start of floods on the 64 creek tributaries. By following this plan, the Washita Valley Flood Control Council hopes to end the flood threat on the Washita River, raise the water table, end sedimentation now depleting capacity of municipal reservoirs along the way, and so maintain and improve the farmability of the lands affected as to maintain the highest possible agricultural yield.

The Washita Valley project in Oklahoma is the furthest advanced of 11

such demonstrational projects in America. It must be completed and the number of other such projects must be increased manifold if this Nation is to maintain its high level of agricultural economy.

It is to this end, Mr. Chairman, that I urge this body's wholehearted support of H. R. 6788.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and other members of the House Agricultural Committee, in bringing this bill before the House for consideration.

Thirteen years ago, the day after I was nominated to Congress on a soil conservation platform, I attended a statewide meeting in Chickasha in connection with the promotion of a conservation program on the Washita Valley and other areas in my district.

Later, I served 6 years on the House Agricultural Committee, which sponsored several measures pertaining to advancement of the Soil Conservation Service program and a program providing for creation of State soil conservation districts in Oklahoma.

Thereafter, on various occasions, I appeared before various witnesses in behalf of worthwhile measures pertaining to the soil conservation needs, and assisted in the passage of many pieces of such legislation.

In cooperation with our able Soil Conservation Service officials in Oklahoma, and with local soil conservation districts of Oklahoma, and with the further cooperation of civic officials, farm leaders of Oklahoma, and Dr. Hugh Bennett, we were able to secure the first pilot projects of their kind for the construction of detention dams, reservoirs, contouring, terracing, and treatment of streams and tributaries in the Nation at Cowden, Cloud Chief, on the Washita basin, on the Sandstone project, and other projects, which have served as models for the entire Nation.

I attended the dedication services of these projects.

Several years ago, Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, Congressman BOB POAGE, of Texas, and I introduced measures to establish a temporary commission known as the Commission on Flood Control and Soil Conservation, composed of 5 members appointed by the President. The Commission to have the authority to study, first, the effects of complete watershed programs; second, the costs and benefits from such upstream watershed programs; and third, the feasibility of allocating each year a percentage of Federal flood-control funds to upstream conservation projects. Many of the features of the bills introduced by us are embodied in the bill you are now considering. Later, to-wit: January 3, 1953, I introduced H. R. 194, containing the same provisions.

Due to extreme soil-erosion caused by winds and flash floods in Oklahoma, and droughts at other times, great interest has been created in our State. Four

gentlemen, Dave Vandevier, of Chickasha; Dick Longmire, of Pauls Valley; George Hutto, of Pauls Valley; and L. L. Males, of Cheyenne, deserve a lot of credit for securing 50,000 signatures urging passage of measures similar to the ones Senator MIKE MONRONEY and I introduced; later, these four gentlemen prepared attractive factual brochures, setting forth the urgent need and prompt action necessary to save the soil of our country and preserve the economy of our farmers and the Nation, which Senator MONRONEY, other Oklahoma Members, and personally presented to all you Members of the House and Senate individually.

The measure before you is a good bill; however, it does not go far enough. This generation must act promptly to preserve the soil from the apparent serious devastating effects that not only threaten our soil, but are causing the loss of life, property, and lowering our water tables to the danger level. My many years' experience as a dirt farmer has taught me many lessons.

I personally believe that in 25 years there will be more joy in the discovery of good water for home consumption, commercial and industrial use, irrigation, and so forth, than there will be over the discovery of a new oilwell.

I have made official inspection trips to many countries where people are literally starving to death, due to the loss of their soil. I saw many of their citizens carrying bushel baskets of soil back from the valleys to the terraces on the hills. In some instances soil was worth its weight in money. If we, as custodians of the earth, do not care for the remaining 3 inches of topsoil in this world, then in 200 years no food will be raised.

This bill does not create a new agency. It implements the existing agency and provides for completion of projects previously authorized and under way, as well as an authorization, permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes. It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture carry out these provisions. It was the intent of the President that we enact such legislation.

I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture will make it possible to complete the Washita Basin project and other projects in western Oklahoma without delay.

Our soil and our youth represent two very valuable resources. Our population is increasing by leaps and bounds. Our national income is, was, and always will be seven times the income of the farmers, consequently, it is in the interest of all our citizens that we preserve our soil and maintain a high farm income in order to maintain a high economy in all fields.

Let us stop the rain where it falls. Let us remove the uncertainty caused by year-to-year authorizations and budgets, and provide a long range, continuing program, with a revolving fund.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to compliment the present officials in the Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, our Gov. Johnston Murray, the

Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, the various soil-conservation districts of Oklahoma, and the agricultural colleges at Stillwater, Cameron, and Goodwell, the farm organizations, farmers and civic-minded citizens of Oklahoma, who have taken the lead in preaching soil conservation.

I know that erosion, floodwater, and sediment damages in the watersheds of many rivers and streams of the United States causes considerable loss of life and serious damages to property. This constitutes a menace to the national welfare.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, when the 1st session of the 83d Congress was considering the agriculture appropriation bill, I introduced an item providing for upstream development. I discussed the matter with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and I found out what his object was in putting that \$5 million item in the current budget.

The day I spoke in favor of the item in the budget I explained that we have in West Virginia a peculiar situation. Sections of seven counties in my district are susceptible to flash floods. Over the past 10 years flash floods in that 7-county area have caused the death of 84 persons and have destroyed hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of dollars worth of property. It is a hilly section where the hills are steep and where all the timber has been removed and where the rainfall when it hits the hillside goes down into the valleys, and the valleys are narrow, and every one of those flash floods comes along and just destroys all the property in the valley.

In consideration of that situation the Department of Agriculture has placed in that area one of the new demonstration projects of upstream development. Our citizens in the city of Salem and the Salem fork of Ten Mile Creek are cooperating wholeheartedly. The Soil Conservation Service has joined in with the citizens' groups; they are putting up their part of the finances. The reason we asked the Conservation Service to join in the project was the fact that they are operating a nursery and we can get the trees necessary to replant the hillsides.

That project is located along Route 50, which is traveled by hundreds of thousands of people annually. They say they want to make that a showplace, a demonstration, where thousands of people can see the possibilities of this type of upstream development.

In my district as a whole there are six projects that have been authorized for construction by the Army engineers. None of them will solve this situation because of their location and because of the fact that they are not of the type to meet the situation with which we are faced.

May I add, Mr. Chairman, that in the State of West Virginia our legislature will, at its next session, consider legislation setting up a watershed-area pro-

vision so that the different watersheds of the State can organize, join in with the Federal legislation that is being proposed here, and the State can make contributions toward the construction, and with local contributions we really hope to do something for some of those areas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly endorse House bill 6788 and recommend its enactment.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and assist local organizations, including State governments and local agencies such as soil-conservation districts and flood-control districts, upon their request, to prepare and carry out plans in small watersheds for works of improvement in the field of flood prevention, and agricultural phases of the conservation, development, use, and disposal of water.

The bill contains the sound principle of local initiative and responsibility.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWARD].

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in the intent and objective of this bill. I own a ranch in Montana where I have spent thousands of dollars in carrying out the very kind of program which is contemplated in this legislation. I expect to continue spending that kind of money out of my own pocket. So my interest is not only vocal, but it is also directly financial.

I do, however, have 1 or 2 questions in regard to this legislation which I would like to ask the chairman, and I direct these questions to section 7:

First, this bill repeals certain provisions of the act of 1936 such as to make preliminary examinations and surveys and to prosecute works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the watersheds of rivers and other waterways.

Those are the very things that are contemplated in the new bill. I understood you to say in your presentation that the old legislation was not attaining the objective intended. Since that is a fact, how will this bill encourage those things that were not undertaken under the old bill?

Mr. HOPE. The difficulty with the previous legislation was not in the legislation itself or its objectives, but it was in the procedures set up by which the projects could be undertaken and carried out.

The principal purpose of this bill is to set up the methods and the procedure by which the local communities can establish these projects, work them out among themselves, then submit them to the Federal Government, the Department of Agriculture, for approval. That procedure was not provided for in the other legislation and I think that is the reason it fell down. The theory here is that these projects are going to be organized and set up locally. After that is done then they will come up and be submitted to the Department of Agriculture and, if approved, the appropriations will be authorized and the projects carried out.

Mr. D'EWARD. The second section of the bill says that certain things that affect the Secretary of Agriculture shall not be affected by the provisions of this bill. The Flood Control Act of 1944 is exceedingly important to many districts in the West, including the Missouri Basin. When you limit that provision to the Secretary of Agriculture you have no intention of excluding the authorities granted to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior; is that a fact?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, that is certainly true. The gentleman, I presume, is referring to the proviso on page 6; is that correct?

Mr. D'EWARD. That is right, the second proviso.

Mr. HOPE. The only purpose in putting that proviso in is that 11 projects have been started by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Flood Control Act of 1944. We did not want to interfere with those projects, so we put in this proviso that the act shall not affect them, notwithstanding the repeal of the 1936 provisions.

Mr. D'EWARD. What it actually says is that it shall not affect the Department of Agriculture as it is concerned with the Flood Control Act of 1944, but it does not include the Department of the Interior or the Department of War. It is not the gentleman's intention that those should be excluded?

Mr. HOPE. No. This act does not intend in any way to affect any of the authority or activities of the two agencies which the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. D'EWARD. That act is important to us.

Mr. HOPE. I cannot be too emphatic in saying that there is no intention of doing that.

Mr. D'EWARD. Now, on page 3, paragraph (3), one of the powers which is granted is to cooperate and enter into agreements with and to furnish financial and other assistance to local organizations. Would that include soil-conservation districts, irrigation districts or any other entity that may be established under State law?

Mr. HOPE. Under section 2 there is a definition of local organizations which reads as follows:

Any State, political subdivision thereof, soil- or water-conservation district, flood prevention or control district, or combination thereof, or any other agency having authority under State law to carry out flood prevention and related activities.

"Irrigation district" is not mentioned there, but I presume if an irrigation district under State law has that authority they would be included.

Mr. D'EWARD. They are organized that way under our law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. D'EWARD. I have one more question. I notice in the agencies with which you can cooperate, as mentioned in this bill, it does not say other Federal agencies. It mentions State agencies and the agencies that the gentleman

mentioned, but it does not mention Federal agencies. Does that mean that under this bill the Department of Agriculture could not cooperate with the Bureau of Reclamation in carrying out the provisions of this legislation?

Mr. HOPE. Under section 6 it states:

The Secretary is authorized, in cooperation with other Federal and with States and local agencies, to make investigations and surveys of the watersheds of rivers and other waterways as a basis for the development of coordinated programs.

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct, but that does not include actual construction. It says "surveys, construction," and so forth. Suppose there was drainage needed on an irrigation project or a fill above an irrigation project.

Mr. HOPE. The reason that State agencies are mentioned is because they are the ones that have to put up the money that is contributed by the agencies or by the local interests. I think the answer to the gentleman's question is that any proposals that may be submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture have to be submitted to the President and notice has to be sent to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army before this is done, and then 60 days in which to submit a report which must accompany the submission of the project plan to Congress. Now, that means all this has to go through the Bureau of the Budget, and I am sure that was the intention, that if there are any projects there where the coordinated efforts of the different agencies must be carried out, that that will be worked out through the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to say that it has always been the disposition of the Committee on Appropriations to demand that sort of cooperation because we do not want duplication. We want the most for the taxpayer's dollar.

Mr. D'EWART. I raised that question because it was not specific in the bill and I wanted that statement in the RECORD.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the remarks made by my colleague from West Virginia relative to the situation in certain areas in his district and to say that some of the problems in the lower watersheds of the area that affect his district also affect mine. I think everyone is impressed with the extreme effort that the residents of the old, long-time occupied countries of southern Europe and the Middle East and around the Mediterranean coast have put into their desire to produce some food. They get down on their hands and knees and cultivate small areas, because it is necessary for them to make that effort to sustain life. Then, when you go over into the area of the Andes and see where many generations ago, in an overpopulated country, they had to build up small areas of cultivatable land and maintain those things

by buildup of various types of soil conservation, it is easy to recognize the fact that soil conservation, even in America, as much as we are lacking in overpopulation, some of these days will reach the time when it will be necessary for more people to turn to the soil to sustain themselves. I think this bill as it provides the local authorities an opportunity to make their own plans, suitable to the conditions existing in their own neighborhoods, and the opportunity of going to the Government for some help and some relief toward developing those things, means a great deal in the preservation of the soil for future generations that are coming into our land. We have no reason to believe that as time goes on the destructive influences of winds and floods and various other elements of Nature will leave us a very greatly overpopulated country with a limited amount of soil, but everything we do in this country now to preserve that soil for future generations is something that we all should be proud to endorse.

Mr. Chairman, fortunately I am inclined to want to go along with this bill. While there may be some interferences, some complications between the various departments that may handle these things, yet the amount of money that is necessary to continue these processes throughout the years will amount to a great deal of effort on the part of the people locally, and if the funds are not provided, if the country cannot provide funds, these things will go only so far. But as people go along through life and learn the necessity, learn that they must depend upon these things for their own resources, the resourcefulness of the individuals themselves will help to determine the amount of good that they will get from a program of this kind.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEAL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Does not the gentleman think it is only a matter of good economy to spend money in a program of this kind at this time? It is not an expense; only an investment, and a good investment.

Mr. NEAL. It is the best investment that the present generation can make to future citizens of this country.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to answer just as emphatically as I can and just as eloquently as the gentleman from Mississippi, that this bill in no way creates a new agency; not at all. Then I should like to refer to the same engineer and his statement in the record. I hold in my hand that statement, and I am referring to the statement made a short while ago by my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. The interesting thing about what I am going to read is that it comes before the statement by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. Another interesting thing about it is that it is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, January 27, 1954. It was made by this Army engineer on February 16, 1954. Of course, I cannot un-

derstand that any more than I can understand what the engineer said. I ask the committee to listen to what he said, and the paragraph just previous to what the gentleman read:

In many cases small reservoirs in upstream tributary valleys, properly located and designed, may offer the best solution of local flood problems. Large numbers of small dams, however, do not provide adequate or economical flood reduction on large rivers and major tributaries.

All we needed was to have the whole story. So the Corps of Army Engineers in no way are affected by this bill.

I think I could not do better than to read just what our committee said when we sent the House this report:

The purpose of this bill is to provide the legislative authority and direction for cooperative Federal-local action in attacking the problems of upstream soil and water conservation and flood prevention. The bill will provide the policies, the framework, and the standards under which action in this field can be taken jointly by the Federal Government, States, counties, and other local government entities, soil conservation or watershed districts and local citizens' groups. . . .

Under the policies established by the bill, plans and projects will not be handed down from the top as part of some overall development plan, but can be initiated only by the people of the localities most intimately involved and can be carried into operation only with the fullest cooperation and initiative on the part of local groups and agencies.

I should like to say a word about the hearings. I hold a copy of those hearings in my hand. In these hearings we tried as best we could to cover the sections directly affected by upstream and careful watershed cultivation practices and development. We had the Far West close to the Rocky Mountains, and that region. And then we had the Mississippi Valley and we also had the Kansas River.

I will not go into detail of those hearings, but we had some very interesting statements in those hearings. I should like to read from the Colorado authority about the very thing we are trying to do:

There isn't any adequate, coordinated, inclusive planning at the Federal level in our water-development agencies.

The confusion and cross-purpose action and spending at the Federal level is repeated in a degree in every State. State engineers, water boards, drainage commissions, conservation departments—all operating within some limited, law-defined field—get in conflict and competition just as the Federal boys do.

Even municipalities with a water board, a sewage commission, a health department having some interest in both instances, city engineers, and other boards, may be giving top-rate service in their limited, circumscribed jobs. But no inclusive water-use plan exists.

The waste of the multiplicity in all agencies we have set up to handle our water resources, the segmentary fields in which they work, the conflicts and competition that result, are enough to scare the bristles off any person who will think a little soberly and inquiringly into how helter-skelter is the way we are assigning the management of water wealth to public bodies. Nothing but waste and conflict can come out of such a system—or rather the lack of any all-embracing system.

Far beyond the wastefulness of funds is our losses in the piecemeal, cross purpose, messing up of that cheap but precious resource we have in water. In the past, any one board or agency might have been in a position to draw on our water "bank account" for supplies needed to carry out objectives assigned to a specific agency. More water was available than demands required. That time is past.

Before becoming too critical, business and industry should give a searching look at their position in water management. Water is public wealth. No individual or interest can secure fee title to water. What may be acquired is a right to make use of water at some point in transit from high watershed to rivers' mouths.

The right to utilize water does not carry with it the privilege of destroying or excessively diminishing further usability. The manufacturing plant now drawing water from a relatively unpolluted source, but dumping wastes back into a stream to the detriment of other uses below, may tomorrow find operations threatened by a new plant that is a waste dumper in its essential supply.

Business and industry, as a matter of purely selfish but constructive interest, can do a lot of policing within its own ranks. Anyone who wishes to criticize is in a far more defensible position if they have corrected their own bad behavior before they start throwing rocks at the other fellow.

There is a lot of work to be done to secure sound water management—and we've all got to work at it.

First from the standpoint of wiping out confusion, competition, and cost, we must move swiftly to a water-management policy and plan which will start with management up where the raindrop falls. Planning must start with the watershed; not downstream. Second, and far beyond the factor of wasted dollars, we must have such planning and management inclusive and integrated, to guard against the certainty that our present crisscross activities are leading to—to the certainty of so badly jigsawing our water wealth that we never can get an overall plan for the water resource and its full use in the future.

But there is no place in tomorrow for a bumbling, bungling, conflicting handling of water by public agencies. Water is just too totally indispensable in American living to tolerate the present jumble in water-resource management that exists across the Nation.

In closing, let me say that is exactly what we had in mind, that is exactly what this committee intended to do, to take our whole watershed protection and development program and carry it out in such a way that all the local communities and local watersheds throughout the entire United States, the East, the West, and the middle, would be represented, and the program would be carried out just as well as it possibly could be done, starting at the grass roots or at the beginning of the falling of the water itself.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield this time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most popular bills ever presented to the House. It seeks to harness the raindrops where they fall. It provides for full cooperation at the grassroots. It is a voluntary program without any semblance of compulsion.

One of the 11 large watershed projects established under the Flood Control Act of 1936, the Little Sioux project, is within my congressional district. The work on this project will not be re-

tarded by this bill. In fact, the program will be enhanced. Remarkable progress has been already made on this project.

Subsequent to the Floyd River flood of June 7, 1953, in my district, I asked that 1 of the 50 pilot plants authorized by the agriculture appropriation bill of 1953, be established in my district. This was done and I am happy to say that within a period of only a few months after the flood, an organization of interested farmers and townspeople formed the Floyd River Valley Association for the purpose of carrying out flood-prevention and soil-conservation practices in the Floyd River Valley. Two projects have already complied with the requirements of the law and have already been organized in the Floyd Valley. They are the Plymouth watershed project in Plymouth County and the Nassau project in Sioux County, Iowa. There is the finest cooperation on all sides, and if the same kind of cooperation prevails in the future, it will only be a matter of a very few years before the Floyd River Valley will have a complete system of flood control. I do not know of anything more worthwhile that has ever been attempted in the Floyd River Valley. I strongly urge the passage of the bill we are now considering. It is a great step forward in the field of soil conservation and flood control.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and that amendments may be in order at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request from the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That erosion, flood-water, and sediment damages in the watersheds of the rivers and streams of the United States, causing loss of life and damage to property, constitute a menace to the national welfare; and that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should cooperate with States and their political subdivisions, soil or water conservation districts, flood prevention or control districts, and other local public agencies for the purpose of preventing such damages and of furthering the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water and thereby of preserving and protecting the Nation's land and water resources.*

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act, the following terms shall mean:

The "Secretary"—the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

"Works of improvement"—any undertaking for flood prevention, including structural and land-treatment measures, and agricultural phases of the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water in watershed or subwatershed areas not exceeding 250,000 acres and not including any single structure which provides more than 5,000 acre-feet of total capacity. A number of such subwatersheds when they are component parts of a larger watershed may be planned together when the local sponsoring organizations so desire.

"Local organization"—any State, political subdivision thereof, soil or water conservation district, flood prevention or control district, or combinations thereof, or any other agency having authority under State law to carry out flood prevention and related activities.

SEC. 3. In order to assist local organizations in preparing and carrying out plans for works of improvement, the Secretary is authorized, upon application of local organizations—

(1) to conduct such investigations and surveys as may be necessary to prepare plans for works of improvement;

(2) to make such studies as may be necessary for determining the physical and economic soundness of plans for works of improvement, including a determination as to whether benefits exceed costs;

(3) to cooperate and enter into agreements with and to furnish financial and other assistance to local organizations: *Provided*, That, for the land-treatment measures, the Federal assistance shall not exceed the rate of assistance for similar practices under existing national programs; and

(4) to obtain the cooperation and assistance of other Federal agencies in carrying out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall require as a condition to providing Federal assistance that local organizations shall—

(1) furnish without cost to the Federal Government all easements and rights-of-way needed in connection with works of improvement installed with Federal assistance;

(2) assume such proportionate share of the cost of installing any works of improvement involving Federal assistance as may be determined by the Secretary to be equitable in consideration of anticipated benefits from such improvements: *Provided*, That no part of the construction cost for providing any capacity in structures for purposes other than flood prevention and features related thereto shall be borne by the Federal Government under the provisions of this act; and

(3) make arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary for defraying all costs of operating and maintaining such works of improvement.

SEC. 5. At such time as the Secretary and the interested local organization have agreed on a plan for works of improvement, and the Secretary has determined that the flood prevention and soil conservation benefits exceed their costs, and the local organization has met the requirements for participation in carrying out the works of improvement as set forth in section 4, the Secretary is authorized to participate in the installation of such works of improvement in accordance with the plan: *Provided*, That in participating in the installation of such works of improvement the Secretary, as far as practicable and consistent with his responsibilities for administering the overall national agricultural program, shall utilize the authority conferred upon him by the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That, before such installation involving Federal assistance is commenced, the Secretary shall transmit a copy of the plan and the justification therefor to the Congress through the President: *Provided further*, That any such plan (a) which includes reclamation or irrigation works or which affects public or other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, or (b) which includes Federal assistance for floodwater detention structures, shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Army, respectively, for his views and recommendations at least 60 days prior to transmission of the plan to the Congress through the President. The views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Army, if received by the Secretary of Agriculture prior to the expiration of the above 60-day period, shall accompany the plan transmitted by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Congress through the President.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized in cooperation with other Federal and with States and local agencies to make investigations and surveys of the watersheds of rivers and other waterways as a basis for the development of coordinated programs. In areas

where the programs of the Secretary of Agriculture may affect public or other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture in the planning of works or programs for such lands.

Sec. 7. The provisions of the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), as amended and supplemented, conferring authority upon the Department of Agriculture under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture to make preliminary examinations and surveys and to prosecute works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the watersheds of rivers and other waterways are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That the authority of the Department of Agriculture, under the direction of the Secretary, to prosecute the works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention authorized to be carried out by that Department by the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as amended, shall not be affected by the provisions of this section.

Sec. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 6, line 16, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "such sums to remain available until expended."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, all the Members will understand that this of necessity must be a continuing program. We on the Appropriations Subcommittee are placed in difficulties if all the money is not expended as of June 30 and the portion not expended is not permitted to continue into the next fiscal year. We are faced with that difficulty right now. I think it is estimated that about \$500,000 will be left available unexpended of the \$5 million that was appropriated last year. This simply makes as a matter of law authorization each year to continue whatever amounts may be available.

This is a very simple amendment. I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. As of this date, I believe that less than \$200,000 has been allocated and contracted for with the local communities.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As the gentleman knows, however, there will be considerable amounts allocated and expended this spring. Contracts are already in process of being let, but undoubtedly there will be some amounts not expended each June 30. I think it is very essential to have this little amendment in the bill so as to carry out the intent of the Congress in the annual appropriations which will be made.

Mr. HORAN. We must understand, I think, that actually we are entering into valid contracts with local people in these cases, and it is a slow moving program at first at least, and we should provide that they will not be let down in this particular case.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the committee can see fit to do this, it will prevent much misunderstanding in the

future. We all want this program to succeed and make a better America for the generations yet to come.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I compliment the chairman, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, of the subcommittee on agriculture appropriations and his committee for the foresight that they have shown to set this program in motion, and I also compliment the gentleman on offering his amendment to protect the integrity of the entire program. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota very much. Mr. ANDRESEN has through the years worked consistently for a strong agriculture and is recognized among the great farm leaders of our times.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, the former Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly have no objections to the gentleman's amendment. I have no right to speak for the minority, but I would like to know the views of our chairman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would say to the gentleman from North Carolina that my subcommittee on appropriations has discussed this in committee, and we would appreciate it very much if this can be done.

Mr. HOPE. I will say to my friend, if the gentleman will yield, that with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] I too commend the subcommittee for its foresight and the action of its chairman in offering this amendment. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. May I say were it not for the help of a good many Members of the House on both sides, we would not have been able to put in the initial \$5 million and start this worthwhile program last year.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. While bouquets are being thrown back and forth, I think the committee should know that the highest cooperation prevails between the legislative Committee on Agriculture and the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the Department of Agriculture appropriations. We have much in common and have been able to work out our problems together in a very fine way.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am really gratified at the close cooperation which exists between the two committees dealing mainly with agriculture, the committee of which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is chairman and my Subcommittee on Appropriations. We have always worked very closely together.

Mr. Chairman, to illustrate the value of the Andersen-Hope watershed program, I will secure permission in the House to insert at this point an article appearing in the March 6 issue of that

great farm periodical, the Farmer, published in St. Paul, Minn. Mr. Harold Severson vividly explains the possibilities of what this program will do in the future.

The article is as follows:

FIFTY COMMUNITIES IN FLOOD CONTROL AREAS—FARMERS, TOWNSPEOPLE, AND TECHNICIANS JOIN TO CUT DAMAGE FROM RAMPANT WATER

(By Harold Severson)

When a raging torrent floods into a man's farm and ruins his fields of corn and grain, he immediately becomes interested in flood-control measures.

Multiply that man by thousands of others—not only in Minnesota but in every State of the Union—and it is easy to understand why farmers and city people are seeking to hobble runaway rivers and creeks.

Uncontrolled floods hammer, smash, destroy. They hurt small farms and cause damage in villages, towns, and cities running into millions of dollars. The city housewife who finds 6 to 8 inches of mud in her home after a flood and the farmer who has lost his years' income when flood waters swept over his fields have a great deal in common.

#### FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE

For that reason, Congress has authorized a different approach to floods and the soil-erosion problem. Funds have been appropriated to set up 50 projects throughout the United States to handle this big job on a watershed basis.

Some of these watershed projects are relatively small—like the one in Fillmore County, Minn. Others are larger and more complex. Biggest of all is the watershed program for the Chippewa River and its tributaries and Hawk Creek in Swift, Chippewa, Renville, and Kandiyohi Counties, also in Minnesota. Approximately 2,400 square miles of land in the Chippewa project will be covered as compared with a 150-farm block of land in the east Willow Creek, undertaking in Fillmore County, southwestern Minnesota.

This program calls for a vast amount of planning and fieldwork. A high degree of cooperation will be required between farmers and technicians if it is to be carried to a successful completion.

Work on the two Minnesota projects started last fall after Congress approved the Andersen-Hope bill for the program. Up at Benson, Minn., a small force of technicians under the supervision of Lee Moore, area conservationist for the United States Soil Conservation Service, is engaged in making surveys in order to complete a work plan for the huge project.

"The problem up here is somewhat different from that facing technicians in Fillmore County," Moore explains. "Down there, flash floods occur during storms of high intensity. Only one small watershed, the East Willow creek area, is involved. Up here, we're dealing with several streams including the Chippewa River and Mud Creek. The terrain here differs from that in Willow Creek. Our land is gently rolling with slower runoff and less possibility for supporting practices such as terracing and contour stripping. Nevertheless, that is what we need here."

#### MAY BUILD RESERVOIRS

Consulting engineers have urged creation of reservoirs to trap water before it pours into the Chippewa River and its tributaries and into Mud Creek. Other flood-control measures will be terraces and contour strips that will hold the water and permit it to soak into the fields and pastures.

"We call this 'insoak,'" Mr. Moore explains. "The more water we can get to soak into the ground, the less will empty into the creeks and rivers of this watershed. We think it will be one of our most effective methods of

preventing floods. But here again we'll have to get the cooperation of individual farmers."

Sponsoring organization for the Mud Creek watershed project is the Swift County Soil Conservation District. Ruddy-faced, hard-driving John Riley, chairman of the district's board of supervisors, explains the organization has agreed to assume its share of responsibility for a watershed protection program in the Shakopee watershed.

"We need to use every device known to the Soil Conservation Service to increase infiltration," Mr. Riley emphasizes. "Storage basins are part of the answer. So are crop rotations, terraces and strip cropping. Otherwise, water pours down from the higher ground into the creeks and rivers and cause damaging floods."

#### DAMAGE WAS HEAVY IN 1953

Alfred I. Johnson of Benson, Minn., chairman of a flood control and water conservation association, claims floods last June damaged 26,000 acres of crop land with a potential average crop income of \$50 an acre. This would total \$1,300,000, according to Mr. Johnson's figures.

A representative serving in Minnesota's legislature for several terms, Mr. Johnson points out that damage hasn't been confined to farms alone. Virtually every basement in Benson, Kerkhoven, Murdock, and DeGraff was flooded. Merchants suffered heavy loss due to water-soaked merchandise. Streets were flooded, sewer mains broken and the sewage disposal plant in Benson left almost inoperative. In addition, taxpayers were hit by the need of repairing roads and bridges damaged by the flood waters.

Engineers point out that it takes more than ditches to handle the water dumped into the rivers and creeks after each heavy rainstorm. For example, south of Benson ditch No. 5 empties into a much smaller ditch—No. 12. No. 12 ditch empties into the Chippewa River. Unfortunately, these ditches are becoming choked with trees and brush and no longer do an adequate job of handling flood waters.

#### LOST CROP 2 YEARS

What this means to a farmer is explained by Christ Haugen, who, with his brother, Ed, operates a 240-acre farm.

"For 2 years in a row," he says, "a 40-acre field has been drowned out. We had this planted to soybeans and corn. Total loss both years."

Three other Haugen brothers—Albin, Marvin, and Henry—lost in the neighborhood of 100 acres of soybeans, corn, and grain as a result of floods.

Roland Price, a tenant farmer operating a 200-acre farm owned by Leslie Larson, of Benson, was hit hard, too.

"Water stood for a couple of months on Price's farm," Mr. Larson said. "Second year in a row for him, too."

Ernie Young, another farmer operating in that section, had more than 125 acres under water.

"It hurts—especially when you're hit 2 years in a row," Mr. Larson declares. "Our ditches are getting plugged with these fast-growing willows. There's too much mud and slush in them. Water that used to go out in 24 hours after a flood now stays on the field for much of a summer. We need flood-control measures—badly."

Down in Fillmore County, the flood damage concerns townspeople as well as rural people.

Tall, conservative-minded W. A. Garratt, vice president and cashier of the Farmers and Merchants State Bank, of Preston, points out that sheet erosion is a major problem of the watershed. Gullying also has caused heavy damage.

To emphasize the importance of the watershed project, Mr. Garratt ordered a map prepared to show the area covered by the program. This was shown in a conservation

booth sponsored by the bank at the recent Fillmore County fair. It then was displayed in the bank lobby.

"Merchants and professional people have a stake in this project," Mr. Garratt points out. "When a farmer's income is slashed because the best part of his soil is washed away, merchants in a farming community like Preston are affected. Gully erosion has damaged farmland heavily. Many natural watercourses cannot be crossed with farm machinery. A number of the gullies are 3 to 6 feet deep with a steep gradient."

#### HITS RURAL AND URBAN AREAS

"These things reduce crop yields," Mr. Garratt declares. "And when crop yields are hurt, it hits the merchants and professional people where it hurts—in the pocketbook."

The East Willow Creek area often is subjected to flooding rainstorms that deluge the fields and pastures. The storms usually do not last very long but the rain comes sluicing down, causing rapid runoff and serious soil losses. Flash floods occur during these high-intensity storms and are responsible for flooding of East Willow Creek. These floods usually occur during the early portion of the growing season. For this reason, farmers grow corn on a major portion of the bottomland and keep the remainder of their farms in pasture.

East Willow Creek itself is nothing remarkable. It is a narrow, extremely crooked stream. The channel is 6 to 10 feet deep and seldom more than 30 feet wide from bank to bank.

"You can see the extent of erosion by watching the creek after a heavy spring or summer rain," Mr. Garratt says. "Then the creek is so muddy it looks like all the soil is being floated away."

Engineers estimate that on the upland, sheet erosion is removing an average of 280,000 tons of topsoil annually. Gully erosion is damaging approximately 12 acres each year. Over a 10-year period, that means the equivalent of a 120-acre farm is lost. Erosion on bottomland includes stream-bank erosion and flood-bank scouring.

#### SEE REMEDY IN 5 YEARS

Five years from now—provided all the farmers in the East Willow watershed sign up for the project—flash floods along this creek will be a thing of the past.

Willow Creek will run crystal clear after a drenching thunderstorm.

The soil will stay in place even though the rain is pouring down.

And, most important of all, yields of grain and corn will be increased.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 5, line 1, strike out the colon and insert the following: "and shall come into agreement with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives with respect to such plan."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will do nothing other than require the Department of Agriculture to return these projects to the House and Senate committees and leave some degree of supervision in the hands of the House and Senate. The wording is taken from the National Defense Act.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I favor the gentleman's amendment and I think it is an excellent idea that after the men in the bureaus have gone over the projects, they should present them to the legislative committees, as is proposed in the gentleman's amendment, and I urge the adoption of the amendment in the interest of conservation.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. I, like my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, am in accord with the purpose of the amendment. However, the gentleman from Texas may recall that when a similar bill went down to the Bureau of the Budget for a report the question was raised about a similar provision and we were told that such a similar provision in other previous acts had been held unconstitutional by the Attorney General and two bills had been vetoed which contained provisions of this type. Now, I do not know that the language which the gentleman suggests would necessarily be held unconstitutional by the Attorney General.

I would like to leave the matter this way, as far as I am concerned—I am not speaking for any other member of the committee, but as far as I am concerned I would be willing to have the Committee of the Whole adopt the amendment and take it to conference. In the meantime, perhaps we can get in touch with the Bureau of the Budget and see what they have to say about this particular form of amendment which the gentleman has submitted.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman's suggestion is a sound one. None of us wants to jeopardize the validity of the bill. If we can be shown that it does, obviously we will drop it out when we go to conference. But, of course, I do not feel there is anything unconstitutional about the proposal. I know it is the identical wording under which the Armed Services Committee now operates, and I can see no reason why it should not be applicable here. It will give us greater congressional interest in this program if we have this in here, and I believe we need to maintain congressional interest over a period, if we are going to make this program a success.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Alabama: On page 4, line 9, after the word "improvement", insert a comma and add the following: "in accordance with regulations presented by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the additional language to that section would insure that the works of maintenance and improvements on these projects will be prosecuted in accordance with the authorization of the Congress. That is all the amendment

does. It gives that assurance that the Secretary shall have that supervisory control of the project.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama, whom I regard as very high authority on legislation relating to flood control and water conservation, and whose committee conducted a very noteworthy hearing a few years ago on this subject, spoke to me about this amendment. It seems to me it strengthens the bill, and I hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CANFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6788) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 454, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The Committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier this afternoon and include a magazine article relating to this program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this legislation which is a great step forward in soil conservation. The pattern it follows is sound. The fact that local communities must initiate

such programs and pay part of the costs makes it sound and economical.

I would like to point out that sometime over a year ago, about 50 or 60 outstanding soil conservation leaders met at the White House with President Eisenhower and pointed out the great value and need for such legislation. The President was so convinced that he endorsed their proposal.

We Members of the Appropriations Committee, many of whom had seen the need for such a program for some time, and in the belief that this session of the Congress would authorize legislation approving this great step forward in soil conservation, took the initiative by writing into last year's appropriation bill \$5 million to be used in setting up what was termed "pilot plants," to encourage farmers to make an early start in beginning plans and operations designated by our committee to prevent soil erosion and to help prevent damage by floods through proper soil use, the building of small lakes and ponds, greater use of cover crops, in an effort to prevent water run-off at the sources of streams, and hold back water on the farms, and to prevent undue flood damages.

The pilot plant tests we provided, which have met with such unanimous approval by soil-conservation leaders, has resulted in this legislation being passed, today, which spells out the policy to follow in this great forward step in soil conservation.

When the farmers initiate a cooperative effort, complying with this legislation along small or large streams, the Federal Government will encourage them by contributing about 50 percent of the cost of such projects. The purpose of this legislation is to keep as much of the water as we can close to where it falls. When water falls from the sky and sinks into the ground, it is beneficial in raising the water table. We in southern Illinois went through the worst drought last year in our history, with the water level sinking lower than ever before, which compelled thousands of farmers to haul water, when they could find it, and resulted in a tremendous crop loss.

From that experience, one can realize the great value to our section of the State had we been able to keep throughout the months preceding the drought, more of the rainfall in the ground, rather than to let it flood into the streams.

This new program, to keep more of the water where it falls, I am sure will spread rapidly in our section of the State when it is better understood, and which will spread over the Nation, will help to raise the water tables; will help to store the rain and moisture in the ground; will help to prevent too rapid runoff—washing the topsoil away into the rivers and creeks; will encourage the farmers to use more cover crops, build more terraces, more grass watercourses, and prevent, to a great degree, the washing away of our precious topsoil, and will contribute to greater soil conservation and better farm yields.

If we can keep the water near where it falls, so that it may be absorbed by the ground, it will supply our crops with the necessary moisture and feed our un-

derground sources of water. We have failed to do enough of this type of work in the past.

The water that runs on the surface of the earth often does great damage. It causes the washing away of your soil, fills up reservoirs with silt, fills up creeks and riverbeds; it increases floods, destroys farmlands and crops.

The Government, through the years past, has spent billions of dollars to contain or control floodwaters. Nearly all of such spending has been necessary, and has afforded great protection to farmlands, and has prevented the destruction of cities and villages along the navigable streams.

#### FLOOD PREVENTION

We shall have to continue our flood-control policies of the past, but, may I point out this legislation offers the opportunity not only to protect the soil at the source, where the water falls and along the channels, but to protect it from erosion and washing away.

It is also designed to hold back a part of the water by the use of small lakes and ponds which will help to prevent, in the future, floodwaters from becoming so high, and will reduce in the longer future spending of so many millions of dollars for levees to contain the great floods like we have had in the past. This new program of soil conservation will store more of the water in the good earth where it falls.

No flood ever originated in the channels of the Mississippi or in any other large river or stream. Floods originate in pastures and in fields. Floods originate where the water falls, not in the streams where the water is running.

I know that it will take time, but I make the prediction here and now that this new concept of holding water closer to where it falls, holding as much as we can in the earth where it will help to grow greater crops and prevent soil erosion, will become so popular that, with the Government cooperating financially with the soil-conservation districts set up under this new legislation, within a reasonable time it will have a great effect on preventing floods downstream, and, at the same time, continue its great benefits through soil conservation by preventing too rapid runoff of water along our streams.

Our committee, in cooperating with President Eisenhower, is proud to have taken the first step in launching this very practical program, which will grow in benefits and greatness to our Nation in preserving the fertility of our soil for future generations.

#### REVISING THE INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HALLECK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 473, Rept. No. 1346), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.

R. 8300) to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 7 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

#### ADDITIONAL MESSENGERS FOR OFFICE OF POSTMASTER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 474) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for the employment of three additional messengers, Office of the Postmaster, at the basic salary rate of \$1,940 per annum each.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MARCH 15

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the program for next week will be as follows:

Monday we will call the Consent Calendar. That will be followed by general debate on the bill H. R. 8367, the civil functions War Department appropriation bill.

Tuesday we will call the Private Calendar and continue consideration of the appropriation bill, reading it for amendment under the 5-minute rule. I trust it can be disposed of by early afternoon because we are to have a conference of the Republican Members after the adjournment on Tuesday.

I might suggest the possibility, which can be determined on Monday, of having the House come in at 11 o'clock on Tuesday, but, as I say, that will be determined Monday.

Wednesday we will call up H. R. 8300, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The rule provides for 7 hours of general debate. With 1 hour on the rule and 7 hours on the bill, it will make 8 hours. It would be expected that general debate would continue on Wednesday and Thursday with the expectation of pas-

sage on Thursday because the rule, as is customary on bills of this sort, is a closed rule.

Friday is undetermined.

Conference reports, of course, may be called up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### INTERIM AUTHORITY TO SPEAKER AND CLERK OF HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### THE USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY FOR ELECTRIC POWER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the day is close when commercial electric power will be generated at powerplants using nuclear fuels.

Our deliberations on measures directly or indirectly concerned with the production and use of electric power must, therefore, be prefaced with facts respecting nuclear developments as well as the more conventional data heretofore taken into consideration.

My interest in this subject first was excited when, as a naval officer, I was among the first Americans to visit Hiroshima after V-J Day. During the year 1948 I was employed by the Atomic Energy Commission at the Los Alamos, N. Mex., installations. More lately I have taken naval reserve training duty which included on-the-spot study of the Navy's atomic powered submarine.

It is hoped that this speech today may provide our colleagues background information on this important topic. I will speak on the kinds of atomic reactors

under development, the newly designed battery for direct atomic power, and will summarize the results of initial surveys of atomic energy reactor technology made by four private groups, at their own expense, in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission.

At the conclusion of my remarks, under the leave to extend them which has been graciously granted me, I will append a bibliography on the use of atomic energy for the development of electric power prepared by the Library of Congress on my request. This, I hope, will be of value to those who wish to go further into the subject with their own research.

It is not probable that all conventional electric power sources such as steam and power dams will be outmoded by nuclear developments, but some of them are sure to be. Thus these developments should, but more properly, must, be considered before Congress approves any new Federal power projects. We must avoid spending any millions, or billions, on projects of a conventional nature which would be made obsolete by nuclear advances.

#### KINDS OF ATOMIC REACTORS

The head of the Atomic Energy Commission's Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago, Ill., Mr. Walter Zinn, has stated that drawings for reactors offer endless possibilities. The major variables are the structural materials, fuels, moderators, and coolants used. For purposes of easy understanding, Mr. Lawrence Hafstad of the Atomic Energy Commission has divided reactors into three main types.

First there are the burner-uppers. Then there are the stretcher-outers. The third type are the breeders.

#### 1. THE BURNER-UPPERS

The Atomic Energy Commission buys ores at \$3.50 per pound of contained uranium. The costs of refining this are not public knowledge. Dr. Zinn assumes that the refined material costs 10 times as much.

However, of this natural uranium 99.3 percent is U-238. This is a nonfissionable material. Accordingly, only seven-tenths percent is the fissionable isotope U-235. The burner-upper works on pure U-235. This must be prepared by the vastly ramified, costly gaseous-type fission processes that are employed at Oak Ridge.

Fission consists of the splitting of an atom nucleus, as, for example, when an atom is bombarded with neutrons. Enormous quantities of energy are released when heavy elements, like uranium or plutonium are thus split.

#### EXACT COSTS UNKNOWN

The cost of this is likewise secret. However, several years ago, Dr. Hafstad said that \$20 per gram of U-235 was almost certainly low. He has not altered this figure since.

Assuming this as a cost figure, the 0.14 pounds of useful U-235 in the original bar of metal costs \$1,270. Assuming that the burner-upper will be able to use only 50 percent of its U-235 due to technical difficulties, the original 20 pounds of natural uranium will supply as much useful heat as 91 tons of good steaming

coal. Therefore, the fuel costs of generating electricity will be around 7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

If we contrast this with the 3.5 mills—the average cost of coal at usual thermal generating stations—it is apparent that the burner-upper cannot compete with present conventional costs of producing electricity.

It is suggested that if such burner-upper reactors are ever to be competitive in generating electric power, they will have to be fueled on plutonium, and not on U-235.

## 2. THE STRETCHER-OUTER

We thus see that U-235 is fissionable, while U-238 is not. But, the latter is fertile. By that is meant that it can be converted into material that is fissionable.

When a reactor is loaded with natural uranium which contains both types, or isotopes, the U-235 will fission, and the bombardment of neutrons will convert some of the U-238 to plutonium.

Any reactor that is fueled with natural uranium produces both heat and plutonium. A small experimental reactor at Argonne easily converts 80 percent of its U-238 into plutonium.

## USING MORE URANIUM

At such an 80-percent rate of conversion, the stretcher-outer could derive 5 times as much heat-usable fissionable fuel from an initial 20 pounds of natural uranium. Thus, instead of using 0.7 percent of the natural uranium, as the burner-upper would, theoretically it could use 3.5 percent.

The coal-cost equivalent of the 20 pounds of uranium would now be \$260. Therefore, the fuel costs per kilowatt hour of uranium would be only 1.3 mills.

However, these are only direct costs. They do not include the expenses of maintaining the reactor, and reprocessing the fuel.

The enormous advantages of a fuel that is practically weightless, compared with coal, are evident. However, much of the economics is still obscure. Under Dr. Zinn's calculations, a 150,000 kilowatt plant that was powered by a stretcher-outer could be charged with 61 tons of natural uranium, burn up 20 tons a year, and need no recharge for 3 years.

## 3. THE BREEDER

When the breeder stage is reached, the advantages and the disadvantages compound rapidly. Thus, theoretically, it is possible not only to reach but to exceed a 1-for-1 conversion of U-238 into PU-239. Such breeding makes it possible to consume not just 0.7 percent of the natural uranium as in the burner-upper, or 3.5 percent as in the stretcher-outer, but all of it.

Thus the equivalent of 20 pounds of uranium now becomes 26,000 tons of coal. As a result, the cost per kilowatt hour goes down to the microscopic direct charge of 0.013 per kilowatt hour for fuel. However, there has been very little practical experience gained in breeding.

## FUEL REPROCESSING DIFFICULTIES

Atomic energy scientists recognize the vastly difficult, expensive fuel reprocessing as a major problem for breeder re-

actors. It is here that costs are largely obscure.

## BATTERY FOR DIRECT ATOMIC POWER—RCA ATOMIC BATTERY

The Radio Corporation of America has announced that from a tiny battery—the experimental one being smaller than a fingertip—radioactive atoms can be transformed directly into usable electricity.

Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of RCA, announced this discovery recently. Extremely costly reactors and plants are essential in order to break up fissionable material, thereby generating heat and steam, which in turn may be used to produce electricity. This is a byproduct, indirect, highly costly method of producing electricity. Moreover, only a fraction of 1 percent of the costly uranium is directly useful. The remainder is waste.

## PRODUCING ELECTRICITY SIMPLY

The problem always has been to produce electricity directly, simply, cheaply by using all, or most of the costly raw material. Now one possible answer to this problem has been found.

According to preliminary information, the new RCA atomic battery meets several of these basic objections to the previously costly methods of producing electricity from fissionable materials. Here, briefly, is how General Sarnoff states the RCA battery will work.

Its power comes from an almost invisible amount of radio-active strontium-90. This is part of the waste product that is formed when uranium-235 atoms are split.

## STRONTIUM

Strontium-90 radiates electrons. Each such electron develops 200,000 more electrons. The strontium itself shoots off several billion electrons each second.

In the RCA experiments, the tiny atomic battery produces one-millionth of a watt of electricity. This is enough electrical current to make a whining sound in a telephone earpiece. It is claimed that this battery is good for 20 years, as that is the time it takes strontium to lose half of its power.

## THE TRANSISTOR

One of the essential components of this RCA atomic battery is the transistor tube. It is the tiny substitute for the larger and more complicated vacuum tube. By using the transistor, the electrons flow out of the battery as electricity.

## OPERATION OF BATTERY

The battery functions when strontium is brought close to silicon, and conversely, stops when strontium is pulled away. The battery has a lead shield as strontium-90 is mixed with other atoms that shoot off X-rays. Pure strontium, we are told, needs little, or possibly no shielding. The strontium in the RCA battery costs \$25.

## FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

It is widely held by authorities in the field that this is one important and desirable direction for the future development of electricity from materials possessing atomic energy, namely, a small portable, inexpensive device that can be

used in the home or on the farm. Undoubtedly large central station plants to distribute electricity will also be needed far into the foreseeable future.

With such an atomic battery the time may not be too far distant when standard mechanical products will have such atomic power devices easily available for attachment, as part of their regular equipment.

## EMPLOYING PRIVATE INDUSTRY FOR INDUSTRIAL PURPOSES

The Atomic Energy Commission has been using certain segments of private industry in order to develop the best practical means of converting atomic energy into useful electric power. In doing so the AEC entered into contracts with certain industries, seeking the best ways they could aid in developing to a maximum degree nuclear fission, or atomic energy, for use in society generally.

## PRIVATE GROUPS COOPERATING WITH AEC

Since 1951 the Atomic Energy Commission has contracted with four separate groups to aid the Federal Government in such experiments. In each group there were two private firms. They were asked to make initial surveys of atomic energy reactor technology at their own expense.

The four groups cooperating with the Atomic Energy Commission are:

Dow Chemical Co. and Detroit Edison Co.

Monsanto Chemical Co. and Union Electric Co.

Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and Bechtel Corp.

Commonwealth Edison Co. and Public Service Co. of Northern Illinois.

## WHAT THESE GROUPS AGREED TO DO

The foregoing groups agreed to do the following things for the Atomic Energy Commission:

First. They were to determine the engineering feasibility of their designing, constructing, and operating dual-purpose reactors in order to produce fissionable material and power.

Second. They were to examine the economic and technical aspects of building such reactors in the next few years.

Third. They were to determine what kind of research and development was needed.

Fourth. Finally, it was their task to recommend what role private industry could assume in designing, building, and operating such reactors.

In order that these groups could function properly, and to the best advantage, the Atomic Energy Commission made available to them essential data that it possessed. There was a problem in making necessary information available to industry that was formerly classified. Therefore, the findings of the above study groups were carefully examined. Declassified versions were prepared so as to make such information available to industrial firms and engineers that were interested. As a result, such information is now available in a pamphlet published by the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., entitled "Nuclear Power Reactor Technology."

## LIMITATIONS IMPOSED

It is thus apparent that the information which these study groups submitted, and the information which would be available to industry generally, would be limited in nature for obvious security reasons. This is especially true of detailed information on reactor design. Likewise, the groups themselves had limitations. Take, for example, their instructions to consider dual-purpose reactors. These groups indicated that such proposals are not necessarily those that would have resulted if the studies had been directed to power-only reactors, and with plutonium that would be used only as a fuel.

There was another limitation placed upon their research, and that was that the designs suggested should be those that could be reasonably built in the next few years.

## CONCLUSIONS ON DUAL-PURPOSE REACTORS

Thus, while there is a difference with respect to the designs of reactors, all groups came to the conclusion that dual-purpose reactors are feasible from a technical standpoint. They likewise concluded that they could be operated in such a manner so that the plutonium credit would reduce the cost of power.

At the same time, these groups also agreed that it was not possible to build reactors in the very near future that would be economically feasible solely on the basis of power generation.

## SUMMARY OF FOUR MAIN STUDIES

Before going into the details of the various studies that were made by the foregoing private industrial research groups into the possibility of developing atomic energy for electric power, let us summarize briefly their main conclusions.

## GROUP NO. 1

This group consisted of the Dow Chemical Co. and the Detroit Edison Co. They experimented with sodium-cooled fast-breeder reactors. In their studies they found that such reactors afford a low fuel cost and a high coolant temperature that made for efficient power production.

They went into the question of simplified solid fuel elements. While they approved the design that is now under construction, they indicated the desirability of more mobile fuels. These could include fuels which would be easier for handling as well as for reprocessing. They used solid, slurry, and liquid fuels. They varied from 7,500 to 138,000 kilowatts of electrical output at 30 percent thermal efficiency.

## GROUP NO. 2

The second private industry group consisted of the Monsanto Chemical Co. and the Union Electric Co. They studied sodium-cooled reactors that were graphite-moderated. Two similar designs were examined.

One reactor had 1,000 megawatts—or million watts—heat output. It used a sodium temperature range of 650° to 300° Fahrenheit. It generated 3 million pounds per hour of 150 p. s. i. a.—pounds per square inch absolute, including air-saturated steam. It produced 208,000 kilowatts.

They then pursued their research on another type of reactor which had 3,000

megawatts. Two power cycles were considered. The first one used a full temperature range of sodium from 900° to 300° Fahrenheit. This one is capable of generating 8.8 million pounds per hour of 400 p. s. i. a.—746° Fahrenheit steam. This experiment afforded a net production of 834,000 kilowatts.

In another experiment rejecting heat of sodium below 500° Fahrenheit, it was found that there was an evaporation of 4.8 million pounds an hour. This produced 554,000 kilowatts.

## GROUP NO. 3

The third group consisted of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Bechtel Corp. They experimented with a water-cooled thermal reactor and a sodium-cooled fast reactor. Both had 500 megawatts of heat output.

In the water-cooled reactor, heavy water was used as a moderator. This developed 100,600 kilowatts. They used 175 p. s. i. a.—378 Fahrenheit steam.

The group also experimented with a sodium-cooled reactor that was much smaller physically. This experiment disclosed a generation of 1,600,000 pounds per hour of 500 p. s. i. a.—750 Fahrenheit steam. It yielded 145,300 kilowatts of electricity.

## GROUP NO. 4

The fourth industrial group consisted of the Commonwealth Edison Co. and the Public Service Co. of Northern Illinois. They experimented with a helium-cooled reactor that was moderated by graphite. It had a 350 megawatt heat output. This generated steam at 265 p. s. i. a. at 525° Fahrenheit. Forty-six thousand seven hundred kilowatts of electricity were produced.

They also experimented with a heavy-water-cooled, heavy-water-moderated reactor that had a 1,064 megawatt heat output. The turbines in this experiment operate on 180 p. s. i. a. saturated steam. Two hundred and eleven thousand five hundred kilowatts of electricity were produced.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF THE FOUR GROUPS

Let us now consider in more detail what each of the four principal groups found.

## 1. DOW CHEMICAL-DETROIT EDISON SUMMARY

This group used a liquid metal-cooled-fast-neutron breeder reactor and employed fuel elements of solid uranium. This was the design utilized by the Dow Chemical-Detroit Edison team. Their findings disclosed that this type of design offers high coolant temperatures for steam generation. They are of the opinion that future reactors can use a liquid-metal fuel with continuous reprocessing.

The Dow Chemical-Detroit Edison studies sought to obtain as many desirable characteristics as possible. They used materials, processes, and designs that are in existence now, in a partly developed form. As a result, they concentrated on a liquid-metal-cooled fast-neutron breeder reactor.

They found that this type of operation gives a high coolant temperature essential for efficient power recovery. Fuel elements will be uranium alloy in a solid form. They planned to use uranium in

the breeder blanket as a fertile material for making plutonium.

## ECONOMICAL POWER REACTORS

In the thinking of this group, in order to have economical power reactors, the following seven specifications should be met:

First. A low-cost fuel should be used. That is to say, it must be a breeder reactor, within itself, that converts thorium or depleted uranium into fissionable material. As used by this group, the term "breeder reactor" means one that produces more fuel than it burns.

Second. The second conclusion of this group was that the reactor should be of the fast-neutron type in order to produce an excess of fissionable material above its own needs.

Third. This group also concluded that the reactor should operate at high temperature. They indicated that a core temperature of 950° to 1,100° Fahrenheit may be possible.

Fourth. The next conclusion of this group was that the design should permit integration with a variation of improved extraction processes now under study.

Fifth. They also found that the unit should require a segregated area specified for public safety. They referred to this as an "exclusion area." They claimed that such an arrangement could be minimized by continuous removal and segregation of fission products.

Sixth. This group found that the reactor should use uncanned fuel, preferably mobile or fluid.

Seventh. Finally, they concluded that the reactor should be inherently self-regulating.

## 2. MONSANTO CHEMICAL-UNION ELECTRIC SUMMARY

This group favors a sodium-cooled, graphite-moderated, slow-neutron reactor that uses natural uranium. While they vary in detail, for each of the layouts of the two reactors, their findings compare the power cycles that use heat output in different ways.

This group was concerned primarily with the production of plutonium and power reactors that could be built within the next few years. Their job was to study the feasibility of a reactor that could meet these specific requirements. They found that the production of plutonium for military purposes could be achieved in 5 years. Thereafter, this plant could be run for power alone.

## THE HANFORD REACTORS

Let us first consider their findings concerning the Hanford reactor. In the interest of speed they used the Hanford reactors as a starting point of experience as regards design and construction. They looked into the question of water as a coolant. Because the Hanford reactor would not permit temperature that was high enough for the economical production of power, sodium was chosen.

The reason was that at low pressure sodium can remove more heat than pressurized water. Likewise, sodium does not corrode stainless steel up to 900° Fahrenheit, or higher. Finally, as plutonium production is nearly equal to heat output, the use of a sodium coolant permits more plutonium from a given size reactor.

## THE FIRST CHOICE OF A REACTOR

Accordingly, a sodium-cooled and graphite-moderated design was selected. Metallic uranium was chosen because it minimizes the enrichment required. Likewise, this material is comparatively well known.

In order to leave a margin of safety, a maximum uranium temperature of 1,100° Fahrenheit was chosen.

While two potential designs were determined, both of them had the same general arrangement. Their differences lie in the coolant systems and the techniques of loading and unloading.

## FUEL CHANNELS

This group found that fuel channels can be loaded and unloaded while running at a full load. After a few days of cooling, irradiated fuel assemblies are removed from the reactor. They were transferred to lead shipping coffins which have 12-inch walls. The handling of all fuel equipment is by remote control.

Their work disclosed that the most economical plutonium-power reactor uses enriched fuel. This cost of enriching is more than offset by the resulting production of more plutonium. Thus, there is a lower unit cost.

## COOLANT CIRCUITS

In order to prevent contact, and the resulting violent reaction between sodium and water, a shell and tube heat exchanger would have to have double concentric tubes with a mercury-filled barrier space in between.

In the interest of safety, and the avoidance of hazards of sodium leaks, as well as the radioactivity of sodium in the recirculating system, the entire sodium circuit should be completely leaktight.

## ELECTRIC POWER COSTS

This group estimated the costs of electricity from the foregoing processes. A comparison was made with a modern steam plant in their two studies. In the first case, using atomic energy, with a net output of 210,000 kilowatts, the cost would be \$124 per kilowatt.

In the second case of power development from atomic energy, the net output would be 554,000 kilowatts, and the cost would be \$110 per kilowatt.

These 2 atomic energy power costs of \$124 and \$110 compared with a modern steam-plant cost of \$169 per kilowatt.

Broken down into the cost in mills per kilowatt-hour, the cost of power produced from atomic energy totaled 4.13 and 3.73 mills per kilowatt-hour compared to 3.97 mills per kilowatt-hour, their views on the cost of a modern steam plant.

## 3. PACIFIC GAS &amp; ELECTRIC-BECHTER SUMMARY

This third group made three specific recommendations:

First. The design should be a liquid-metal-cooled fast-breeder reactor. Solid fuel should be used and it should be undertaken immediately.

Second. The construction should start when the layout is completed, unless advances in the arts have made the design obsolete.

Third. There should be developed a liquid-fuel breeder reactor.

This third group found that atomic powerplants are economically justified where they can operate at a high-capacity factor. Such an operation could be integrated into the large Pacific Gas & Electric system where one-third of the demand is the base load.

## SAFETY FACTOR

This group found that public hazard must be considered in the event of a failure of the reactor. Thus, if a reactor should melt because of a failure of cooling, or a runaway, it would release radioactive and poisonous gases. These should not be explosive in force. The group concluded that the gases would be expected to be retained principally in the shielded area, and thereafter in an essentially airtight building.

At the present time, restrictions as to site are based upon the assumption that all radioactive material discharges as a cloud into the atmosphere. Ten years of experience would appear to show that reactors could be operated safely.

## SIZE OF REACTOR

This group found that a 500-megawatt-millionwatt-reactor capacity is a compromise between a smaller development unit and a large and more economical size. The group found that the heat from such a reactor would produce significant amounts of plutonium as well as 100 to 150 megawatts of electrical energy. Two reactors were chosen for study.

## ELECTRIC-POWER COSTS OF SODIUM-COOLED REACTORS

This group also compared the cost of producing atomic electric power compared with the conventional steam powerplant. In their first atomic project, the total investment would be \$51 million. In the second atomic project it would be the same, whereas the third one would involve an investment of \$29,800,000. This compares with an investment of \$14 million in a conventional steam powerplant.

With the foregoing investment, the cost of electric energy would be 12½ mills per kilowatt-hour, 3.6 mills, and 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour in the 3 atomic-energy plants. This compares with a cost of 6 mills in the conventional steam powerplant.

## 4. COMMONWEALTH EDISON-PUBLIC SERVICE SUMMARY

This group concluded that heavy-water-moderated and cooled reactor offers the best economic possibilities. However, they recognized that the gas-cooled reactor has already made a substantial beginning in atomic power, because it causes minimum interference with the production of reactors that are now under construction or are being contemplated.

In the Commonwealth-Edison public service study group, two reactors were considered. The first one was cooled by gas, and moderated by graphite. The second reactor was moderated and cooled by heavy water.

The reason the gas-cooled unit was chosen was due to the fact that more information was available in regard to engineering, construction, and operating experience. They concluded that there

would be less work needed on design data. Also, less time, expense, and research would be needed for development.

## WORK OF ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORIES

The choice of the heavy-water reactor was due principally to the fact that it was conceived by the Argonne National Laboratories. It was this group that was helpful in solving some of the electrical, mechanical, as well as structural design problems. Also, it helped in preparing cost estimates.

## GAS-COOLED REACTOR

This group considered a gas-cooled reactor that has a heat output of 350 megawatts. The design called for two right-circular graphite cylinders. They had adjoining end faces that were parallel to each other on the same center line. These cylinders contain natural-uranium slugs that were arranged in a lattice.

The cooling gas—helium—enters a small gap between the two cylinders, and divides its flow outward through the two reactor sections. A steel shell that is pressurized encases this assembly.

This group considered helium as a coolant. There was a reactor shell which had openings in a 44-foot sphere that permitted the feeding of uranium slugs into the graphite core.

There was a concrete radiation shield that had the shape of a modified quonset hut that completely enclosed the reactor sphere.

Two channels at a time could be charged by a six-cylinder charging machine that operated in a sequence operation.

The more important reactor instruments measured power level, reactor period, temperature, and pressure of helium.

## HELIUM FIGURES

The helium leaves the reactor sphere at 650° Fahrenheit to enter the boilers. It leaves the boilers at 384° Fahrenheit as it enters gas blowers to be returned to the reactor. The multiple takeoffs and the need for a reasonable duct sizes required 12 separate circuits for the helium.

## BOILERS

Boilers are straight-through types, in which economizer, evaporating, and sub-heating sections are combined into one continuous pass. There are 12 boilers, even though 10 of them can develop full reactor power.

## BLOWERS

The axial-flow-type helium blowers must run at a constant flow. Load variations are made by varying the helium temperature out of the boilers.

## PLANT CONTROL

Automatic-control load adjustments hold the reactor helium temperature to 750° Fahrenheit. The group found that in order to achieve high-plutonium production the reactor should be held at a full power rating even while electric generation is reduced.

## ESTIMATED COSTS OF GAS-COOLED REACTOR

The costs that follow are based on conditions in the Midwest. They do not include the costs of fuel fabrication and processing. Assuming a net output of

45,000 kilowatts, the installed cost averages \$889 per kilowatt.

This group estimated the total cost of a gas-cooled reactor to be \$40 million.

#### ESTIMATED COSTS OF HEAVY-WATER REACTOR

When this group considered the heavy-water reactor, they estimated the total cost of installing a plant would be \$118 million.

This \$118 million figure represents a cost of \$492 per kilowatt.

If this reactor was designed for light-water cooling and moderation, it would require enriched fuel, the initial investment could be reduced by about \$47 million. The cost per kilowatt would then drop from the above \$492 to \$297. These cost figures assume that fabricated fuel elements are furnished by others. The cost of initial fuel charge was not included.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF GROUP 4

Considering the present state of reactor technology, this group concluded that the heavy-water-reactor concept had the best economic possibilities. The uncertainties they encountered were the availability and cost of heavy water, and the practicability and cost of chemical plants to process the fuel elements.

This group also concluded that the gas-cooled reactor could provide a substantial beginning in atomic power with a minimum of interference with production reactions that are either under construction at present or are contemplated. They found that fuel elements should be less costly than some of those used in production reactors and that they can be processed in existing plants. They concluded that both the gas-cooled reactor and the heavy-water reactor are feasible from an engineering and operating point of view.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Economic Aspects of Atomic Power**, Sam H. Schun and Jacob Morschak, et al., published for the Cowles Commission for Research in Economics by Princeton University Press, 1950, TK9145-S3: Chapter I, Economic Characteristics of Atomic Power; chapter II, The Cost of Electricity From Conventional Sources; chapter III, The Industry Analyses: A Summary View; chapter XII, Residential Heating; chapter XIII, The Effects of Atomic Power on National and Regional Economies.

**The Impact of Atomic Energy**, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1953: Economic Technology of Nuclear Power, James A. Lane, page 35; Economic Feasibility: The Dual Purpose Reactor, Walker L. Cislser, page 45; Economic Feasibility: The Single Purpose Nuclear Plant, George L. Weil, page 50; Some Economic Consequences of Nuclear Power, Walter Isard and Robert A. Kavesh, page 62; Some Sociological Consequences of Atomic Power, Vincent Heath Whitney, page 67.

Statement of W. STERLING COLE, chairman, Joint Committee of the United States Senate and House on Atomic Energy, May 26, 1953; and statement of Chairman Dean, of the Atomic Energy Commission, presented to joint committee.

**Atomic Power Development and Private Enterprise: Hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy**, Congress of the United States, 83d Congress, 1st session, June 24, 25, 29, July 1, 6, 9, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, 27, 31, 1953.

**Atomic Power and Private Enterprise: Report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy**, 82d Congress, 2d session, joint committee print.

Remarks prepared by Gordon Dean, Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, before the 21st annual meeting of the Edison Electric Institute, Atlantic City, N. J., June 4, 1953; release of Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., June 4, 1953.

**Atomic Power for Industry**, W. L. Davidson, Director, Office of Industrial Development, Atomic Energy Commission, Dun's Review, June 1953, page 27.

**The Key to Atomic Power**, Carl Cohen, Vice President Walter Kidde Nuclear Laboratories, Inc., Garden City, N. Y., Nucleonics, May 1953, page 10.

**Nuclear Power Feasibility Studies**, Nucleonics, June 1953, page 49.

**Should the Atomic Energy Act Be Revised?** Nucleonics, September 1953, page 9.

**Atomic Power in Industry**, Dr. Allen G. Gray, Technical Editor, Steel, March 2, 1953, page 86.

**Atomic Power**, Electric Light and Power, June 1953, page 120.

**The Industrial Development of Atomic Energy**, Gordon Dean, Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, July 1953.

**Atomic Energy Today**, Power, July 1953, page 89.

**Atomic Power as a Risk Venture**, Carl Cohen, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, October 1953, page 305.

**Nuclear Power Development: Atomic Energy Commission Policy Statement**, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, October 1953, page 309.

**Atomic Energy and Private Enterprise**, joint committee hearings, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, November 1953, page 341.

**Atomic Energy and Private Enterprise**, joint committee hearings, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, December 1953, page 380.

**Atomic Energy Developments in Great Britain**, Sir Christopher Hinton, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, December 1953, page 366.

**The Dutch-Norwegian Atomic Energy Project**, Gunnar Randers, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, December 1953, page 369.

**Useful Power from the Atom**, special report, Business Week, March 14, 1953, page 94.

**Industrial Nuclear Power**, Manson Benedict, Technology Review, May 1953, page 358.

**Far More Important Than War**. Remarks prepared by Thomas E. Murray, Commissioner, United States Atomic Energy Commission, before the Electric Co.'s Public Information Program, Chicago, Ill., October 22, 1953, release of Atomic Energy Commission, October 22, 1953.

**Nuclear Energy for Electric Utilities**, Theodore Baumiester, Commercial and

Financial Chronicle, New York, volume 177, June 4, 1953, page 14.

**Electric Energy from Nuclear Power**, Atomic Energy Newsletter, New York, volume 7, June 15, 1952, page 2.

**Industry Enters the Atomic Age**, Some Practical Problems in Applying Atomic Energy, Jerome D. Luntz, The American Management Association, New York, 1953, Manufacturing Series No. 210.

**The Future of Atomic Energy in Power Production**, Power, volume 90, November 1946, page 78; digest of a study prepared as a project of the Carnegie Endowment on Atomic Energy.

**Atomic Power**, Peter Edson, Washington, D. C., News, December 22, 1953, page 37.

**Atomic Industry**, Peter Edson, Washington, D. C., News, December 23, 1953, page 23.

**Nuclear Power Reactor Technology**, Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

**Atomic Power and Private Enterprise**, Samuel Untermyer, Harold Urey, and Lynn A. Williams, Jr.—NBC radio discussion, University of Chicago Round Table, No. 805, September 13, 1953.

**The Development of a Policy for Industrial Peace in Atomic Energy**, Donald B. Straus, National Planning Association, planning pamphlet No. 71, July 1950.

**Atoms You Can Use**, Annesta R. Gardner, technical editor, Modern Industry, January 1952.

**Advisory Committee of the Electric Power Industry Submits Report to Atomic Energy Commission**, Release, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., June 22, 1951.

**The Business Side of the Atom**, David E. Lillenthal, Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, before the Chamber of Commerce of Boston, March 18, 1948, Release, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

**New Horizons for Industry in the Isotopes Field**, Commissioner T. Keith Glennan, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Release, April 5, 1951.

**Atomic Power for Peace**, Address by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, General Assembly of the United Nations, December 5, 1953, Department of State Publication.

**Tagged Atoms Go to Work for Steel**, Steelways, September 1948.

**Industrial Uses of Radio-Active Fission Products**, A Report to the United States Atomic Energy Commission, Stanford Research Institute, September 1951.

**Address Before American Chemical Society on Atomic Energy Day**, remarks of Eugene M. Zuckert, member, United States Atomic Energy Commission, release, Atomic Energy Commission, September 11, 1952.

**Atomic Energy. When? Where? How Much?** An interview with Lawrence R. Hafstad, Director of the Division of Reactor Development, Atomic Energy Commission, Chemical and Engineering News, September 15, 1952, page 3808.

**Today: Atoms Work For Us**, Parade, May 1952.

Industrial Uses of Radio-Active Materials, a selected bibliography, Arthur D. Little, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., research engineer, March 1949.

Britain's Atomic Factories, a hundred-page booklet showing peacetime uses of atomic energy, prepared by the British Government.

The U. S. S. *Nautilus*—first American submarine, Washington, D. C., Daily News, January 20, 1954, pages 7, 25.

#### THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, twice in a single generation, in World War I and again in World War II we have been provided with a stern warning that a strong merchant marine is an indispensable arm of our national defense and security. Each time in critical haste and at tremendous cost, while the success of our military effort was gravely imperiled, we were forced to undertake a vast program of emergency ship construction.

Unfortunately, we do not seem to have learned these lessons of the recent past very well. Once more our merchant marine is slipping backward in number and quality, while our American shipyards are threatened with economic strangulation for lack of continuous orders to keep them going. Not even one order for an oceangoing ship in excess of 1,000 gross tons was placed in a United States shipyard in 1953. Their slim backlog of work in progress is fast running out.

We are confronted with a serious situation in Baltimore. I hold here in my hand an article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun on Friday, March 5, stating that the Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, which was among the largest shipbuilders in World War II, will be completely shut down October 1, because there are no new orders in sight. All the contracts presently on hand will be completed within the next 6 months. This means that 3,500 persons will lose their jobs, plus an economic loss to the Baltimore area of \$70 million annually.

The business situation at the Maryland Drydock Co., another shipbuilding and repairs concern, also located in Baltimore, has reached a critical point. In 1952 the company employed 4,000 persons. This figure declined to 2,500 in 1953 and at the present time there are only 1,031 persons on the payroll, a loss of 75 percent. Maryland Drydock has no backlog of business and is dependent on securing work on a day-to-day basis. Ninety percent of the work on hand will be completed in approximately 30 days, and there is no further work in prospect.

If some relief for the shipbuilding industry in Baltimore is not forthcoming in the immediate future, the port of Baltimore, the lifeline of our city, will be seriously affected. Skilled labor is already going into other areas and into other fields. Should need for emergency ship construction arise once more, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to

secure skilled labor and know-how to build our ships. It would be shortsighted indeed, to permit disintegration of these shipbuilding organizations which have proved to be so vital in time of national crisis.

The Chiefs of Staff and all of us agree that we must have a strong Air Force, Navy, and Army. But we also need a strong merchant marine for our national defense.

Our existing inactive reserve of cargo vessels, while deceptively large in number, consists almost entirely of slow Liberty ships which were obsolete when they were built as emergency vessels in World War II. We have no tankers in reserve and we are seriously deficient in fast passenger ships which could serve as troop carriers if an emergency should strike again.

In addition to its importance for security, a strong and modern merchant marine, under private ownership and operation, with necessary Government aid, is also required for dependable service to our foreign commerce.

These conditions and needs are acknowledged by those who understand our merchant-marine problem. What we must do is to translate our established merchant-marine policy objective into a more effective and sustained program of action which will give us at all times an adequate merchant marine for our commerce and a strong nucleus as an arm of national defense.

I have received many complaints on the lack of contracts let in United States shipyards, while American contracts have been given to the shipyards of foreign countries.

I particularly invite the attention of the Members of the House to the preliminary report of the Senate subcommittee entitled "Merchant Marine Studies," dated February 1, 1954, and to the statement of Mr. L. R. Sanford, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, as contained in the hearings before that Senate subcommittee last summer. The latter is an extraordinarily clear and comprehensive exposition of the merchant marine and shipyard problem. I know you will find this statement very informative.

In summary form, I will set down certain aspects of the current situation in shipbuilding and ship repair:

First. The shipyards are concerned that they have no substantial amount of construction work in sight beyond late 1954.

Second. Complaints continue to be made that too much repair work goes to Government yards instead of private yards.

In this connection President Eisenhower issued a statement to the effect that cities and States in critical areas should receive preference in the letting of Federal contracts.

Third. A sustained stabilized ship construction program is still an unattained objective of our established merchant-marine policy.

Fourth. It is contended that in too many instances contracts for ship construction and repair have been given to foreign shipyards, sometimes in connection with foreign-aid programs.

Fifth. The 1955 Federal budget contains no recommendation for ship construction by the Maritime Administration. I have been informed that the Secretary of Commerce, upon the completion of pending studies, will submit a separate request for ship construction funds. I hope that these recommendations will be speeded up before the shipyards in Baltimore and other areas are forced to close down completely and their skilled organizations are broken up and dispersed.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend the very able and distinguished gentleman from Maryland upon the very compelling and forceful statement he has made on a subject which is of vital interest to the people of the city of Baltimore. I may say that the same situation applies with regard to the people of Brooklyn.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I thank the gentleman very much. I understand the situation is bad all over.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wish to commend the gentleman for his contribution, his large contribution, in reference to the merchant marine. I have been very much impressed. The gentleman has alerted me, and I am sure he has alerted all the other Members of the House. We must follow the counsel and the leadership of the gentleman from Maryland in doing something to save our merchant marine in order that ills may not come to our beloved country.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I thank the gentleman very much for his kind remarks.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman from Maryland, a very able and distinguished colleague, is always in the forefront on everything important to our country. While the matter does touch particularly his own district, I know it touches many districts in the County of Kings, State of New York, as well as other parts of our entire country. I trust that the Congress will pay heed to this warning that the gentleman is bringing to our attention very forcibly.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am most highly gratified that the gentleman from Maryland has addressed the House relative to a serious situation in his home city of Baltimore, both as it affects the industry of shipbuilding and, of course, as it affects the workers and the workers' families. It is not surprising that he has done this so ably and effectively, because ever since coming to Congress he has shown great resourcefulness and great intelligence and dili-

gence in keeping well up with the problems before the House both as it affects his home district and also the nation at large. While in my own city of Pittsburgh there is no shipbuilding as such, just within a few miles of my home district there is quite a large shipbuilding industry on the Ohio River, but they generally build ships of much smaller class. The gentleman has often discussed with me these matters, because many of the problems in my area in the city of Pittsburgh are similar to the problems in his area in Baltimore, and he certainly has shown an awareness of what should be done to relieve some situations that are not very happy, particularly at the present time. I again commend the gentleman.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] has addressed the House on one of the most important subjects that the Members of the House could be addressed on. During the gentleman's remarks he very eloquently and effectively drove home the fact that our merchant marine is an indispensable arm of our national security. That fact cannot be driven home too often. The gentleman, in addressing the House today, has made a very constructive contribution. The gentleman also said: "Once more our merchant marine is slipping backward." That is true.

The gentleman from Maryland has referred to the situation in Baltimore, part of which city he represents with such distinction and credit. While he speaks of the Baltimore situation, the gentleman also has in mind the national situation and the vital importance of our merchant marine as a part of our national security and our national defense.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] in making the address he has made today. It is consistent with the high type of service that the gentleman has always rendered since he has been a Member of this body. I know of no Member that more faithfully and sincerely represents the people of his district than does my friend from Maryland who has just addressed the House. Elected as he is as a Democrat by the people of his district, he represents all the people of his district, whether Democrats, Republicans, or independents.

As former Democratic leader of the House, as I have been for 10 out of the past 13 years and now as Democratic whip, I am glad to join with my other colleagues in complimenting my friend from Maryland in the splendid and constructive speech he had made and in giving testimony to the people of his district that he is one of the finest and ablest and most courageous Members of this body.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I am deeply touched and greatly honored by the kind sentiments expressed by the eminent gentlemen who have been more generous

than just, in their praise of my record in Congress. I am only human. Their remarks will remain with me as a cherished memory to the end of my days. For their confidence, I am grateful.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCHERER, for March 15, 16, and 17, 1954, on account of hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in Chicago, Ill.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to: Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. ALBERT and to include additional matter in remarks to be made in Committee of the Whole on H. R. 6788.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PHILLIPS and to include in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole a statement from the Department of State.

Mr. BENDER in four instances.

Mr. McCORMACK and include a memorandum.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2231. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5509. An act to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 relating to the percent of colonels in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 15, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1348. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1955, involving an increase of \$29,575 for the legislative branch, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 350); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1349. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to permit employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1350. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (1) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1351. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1352. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1353. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1354. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 28, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Zumbro River at Rochester, Minn. This interim report is submitted in response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on March 5, 1952, requesting a review of reports on the Zumbro River and its tributaries, Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works.

1355. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 28, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Port Chester Harbor, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on November 30, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 8367. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 473. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8300, a bill to revise the internal-revenue laws of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1346). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 8350. A bill to authorize the issuance of licenses for the withdrawal of water from the John H. Kerr Reservoir for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8351. A bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance under Social Security Act programs through the issuance to such recipients of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 8352. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 8353. A bill to provide that the classification, rates of postage, zones, weight and size limitations, and other conditions of mailability of fourth-class mail shall be determined solely by the Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 8354. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 8355. A bill to provide for the suspension by the President under certain circumstances of certain provisions of law embodying the Buy American principle; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 8356. A bill to improve the public health by encouraging more extensive use of the voluntary prepayment method in the provision of personal health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 8357. A bill to amend the Standard Container Act of May 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 685; 15 U. S. C. 257-2571), to provide for a three-eighths basket for fruits and vegetables; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H. R. 8358. A bill to amend section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 8359. A bill to provide mandatory price support through March 31, 1956, for

milk and butterfat used in manufacturing dairy products, to maintain the productive capacity of our dairy farming industry, to promote the orderly marketing of an adequate national supply of milk and dairy products, to encourage increased domestic consumption of dairy products in the interest of the national health and security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8360. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees and certain widows of employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8361. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a special accelerated amortization deduction for certain facilities constructed to aid in the abatement and control of air and water pollution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8362. A bill to create a Federal Unemployment Relief Administration to relieve unemployment by providing work on local public improvement and maintenance projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 8363. A bill to make affiliation with the Communist Party of the United States unlawful; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 8364. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended (15 U. S. C. 261-265); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 8365. A bill to confirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to allotments of lands of the Mission Indians in the State of California prior to the expiration of the trust period specified in the act of January 12, 1891, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 8366. A bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance under Social Security Act programs through the issuance to such recipients of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8367. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 8368. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to remove domestic trade barriers affecting milk and milk products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Con. Res. 211. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to set aside and proclaim June 16 as National Blood Donors Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. Con. Res. 212. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that legislation affecting Indians should be prepared in consultation with the Indians so affected; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Res. 472. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that certain measures relating to the protection of the House of Representatives shall be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 8369. A bill for the relief of certain nationals of Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 8370. A bill for the relief of Paula Gandt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS of Illinois:

H. R. 8371. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8372. A bill to recognize the high public service rendered by soldiers who volunteered and served in trench-fever experiments in the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 8373. A bill for the relief of Julian Nowakowski, or William Nowak (Novak); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 8374. A bill for the relief of Herman Wobbe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 8375. A bill for the relief of Ilse Radler Hughes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8376. A bill for the relief of Hanka and Kenneth Kerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Trade, Not Aid, Is Challenge to American Business

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam produces and consumes some 50 percent of the world's goods. Nevertheless, in the field of foreign trade, we have been content to leave the laurels to

others. Perhaps this has been a wise policy in times gone by, but today, trade has implications beyond the market place. In fact, we are constantly concerned by the increased exchange of goods between Western nations and countries in the Communist zone.

Russia has recently swapped substantial amounts of gold for money provided by Britain, France, and our other Western European allies. Trade agreements with Italy and Argentina have been executed by Malenkov in addition to his contacts with England and France. The Russians have come up with an offer to buy more than a billion dollars worth

of ships, electrical machines, and machine-making tools from the British. All of which is mighty tempting to our friends and equally disturbing to us.

It is a matter of statistics that Uncle Sam's private companies did an overseas business of only \$17 billion in 1953 against \$19 billion in 1951. We have plenty of industries that could use some new markets right now, and this is the time to move ahead if Uncle Sam is to remember that a good washing machine may be just as important as a stirring address by a Member of Congress in molding foreign public opinion—and maybe more.